REPORT RESUMES

ED 020 294 UD 006 255

SOCIAL CLASS RESEARCH AND IMAGES OF THE POOR, A BIBLIOGRAPHIC REVIEW.

BY- BLUM, ZAHAVA D. ROSSI, PETER H.
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIV., BALTIMORE, MD.

PUB DATE MAR 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.96 97P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LOW INCOME GROUPS, *ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGEMENT, *SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS, *LITERATURE REVIEWS, *PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, HEALTH, DELINQUENCY, COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS, FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS, SEX (CHARACTERISTICS), ACHIEVEMENT NEED, ASPIRATION, JOB SATISFACTION, PERSONALITY, PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT, INTELLIGENCE, LANGUAGE PATTERNS, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, PERSONAL VALUES,

DRAWING UPON RECENT STUDIES OF SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, THIS PAPER DISCUSSES THE BASIC CLASS-RELATED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POOR. THE POOR ARE DESCRIBED SPECIFICALLY IN TERMS OF COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS, HEALTH CHARACTERISTICS, DELINQUENCY, AND SEX AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS. OTHER CORRELATES OF SOCIAL CLASS POSITION WHICH ARE DISCUSSED INCLUDE THE PERSONALITY AND PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT OF THE POOR, THEIR NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT, THEIR INTELLECTUAL PERFORMANCE AND LINGUISTIC BEHAVIOR, AND THEIR VALUES AND IDEOLOGY. IT IS FELT THAT THESE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POOR DIFFER ONLY QUANTITATIVELY FROM THE CHARACTERISTICS OF OTHER LOWER-CLASS PERSONS. AN EXTENSIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY FOLLOWS THE DISUSSION. (LB)

ED020294

UD 006 255

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOLS

SOCIAL CLASS RESEARCH AND IMAGES OF THE POOR:
A BIBLIOGRAPHIC REVIEW

By

ZAHAVA D. BLUM
NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

AND

PETER H. ROSSI
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL RELATIONS
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SOCIAL CLASS RESEARCH AND IMAGES OF THE POOR: A BIBLIOGRAPHIC REVIEW

By

Zahava D. Blum
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago

and

Peter H. Rossi
Department of Social Relations
The Johns Hopkins University

UD 006 255

Although the preparation of this paper was not supported by the Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, many of the ideas contained herein are relevant to the Center's program of research on Education and Social Change for Negro Americans. Support for the research underlying the paper came from a grant from the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation, and was written while the second author was on a Reflective Year Fellowship from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Their help is gratefully acknowledged.

March 1968

INTRODUCTION

If anything was learned through empirical social research in America in the period since the thirties, it was that socio-economic status is related to a very wide spectrum of behavior. In the thirties, ways were devised for measuring socio-economic status and in the decades since that time literally hundreds of studies have been made in which the social class positions of individuals were found to be related to behavior and attitude.

The purpose of this paper is to extract from the more recent studies of socio-economic status, their implications for our understanding of the characteristics of the poor. The bibliographic effort involved was used as the underpinning for our earlier article in this volume: indeed, that was its main aim. However, a review and summary of the literature in this field has some considerable value in its own right. First of all, such a survey is a good antidote to the "Columbus complex," a state of mind to which social scientists are susceptible and which consists of the tendency to discover over and over again what has been adequately established earlier. Secondly, a review can also show the inconsistencies and gaps in our knowledge. As the reader will learn, it is not entirely clear whether this area of knowledge about our society is an over- or an under-explored territory.

II. A Review of the Literature on Social Class and Poverty:

The literature dealing with social class as a variable is considerable and it was obvious from the start that the entire body of this literature could not be surveyed. Consequently, a number of topics had to be omitted at the outset, and some limits established on the inclusion of material. Since our bias is in the direction of empirical sociology, our coverage of a number of related disciplines is undoubtedly incomplete. The most serious omission is the economic treatment of poverty, an area in which we may claim no particular competence. A number of areas within the usual meaning of social stratification (e.g., occupational prestige, social mobility, and stratification theory) were excluded from the start. We have also eliminated studies dealing with social class measurement and methodology.

We began by systematically screening each issue of the major sociological journals, and a number of related publications, from 1950 to 1966.* Articles which dealt with the correlates of social class position were read and abstracted. Relevant references to separate monographs or to journal articles not subject to the screening were also read and abstracted. In addition, published collections of articles and conference proceedings dealing with poverty were covered. A preliminary draft of our bibliography was circulated to participants in the Seminar on Poverty and to other interested persons. As a results of their cooperation, many omissions were called to our attention, and some unpublished material made available to us. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the August, 1967, meeting of the Sociological Research Association, San Francisco, California, and we have incorporated many of the suggestions arising from this presentation in this revision. In spite of precautions, there are obvious gaps. There is no sure way of estimating the number of relevant articles missed by our screening methods. More seriously, since the start of the "War on Poverty" a great deal of research of the "poor" has been undertaken. Unless, either through chance or sociometric referral, unpublished memoranda from these ongoing researches have passed through our hands, projects which may in a few years contribute the bulk of our knowledge concerning the characteristics of the present-day "poor" are not systematically covered.

---

* American Journal of Sociology, American Sociological Review, Journal of Educational Sociology, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Journal of Social Issues, Marriage and Family Living, Public Opinion Quarterly, Social Forces, Social Problems, Social Work, Sociometry, Welfare in Review.

Our original screening, plus the referrals netted approximately 750 articles and books; clearly, some criteria had to be established for putting manageable bounds on the material to allow for integration and analysis. Given a bias towards empirical research, most of the impressionistic articles dealing with the poor have been excluded. Research studies with obvious deficiencies in either research design, sampling methods, or analysis were excluded on the grounds that their findings and interpretations were of limited or unknowable value. In principle, this is a sound approach; in practice, it has its limitations. A number of areas -- e.g., the place of work in individual self-identification, the possible differential handling of delinquents from various social-classes by law enforcement agencies, the uses of leisure by social class, or the ideology of welfare -- are so sparsely researched that we had to rely on every shred of evidence available for interpretation. In a number of other areas -- e.g., child-rearing practices, educational and occupational aspirations of adolescents, studies relating SES and performance on intelligence tests -- the literature is so extensive that the citations, perforce, reflect some degree of selection among works we considered to be equivalent in value.

A. The Data Reconsidered:

The published literature dealing with those on the very bottom of the stratification system is on the whole somewhat limited. To begin with, few studies have been concerned with systematically describing the characteristics of the very poor, the outstanding exception being the Survey Research Center's survey of income and labor force participation, based on a probability national sample augmented by oversampling of low income households (Morgan, et al., 1962). We are thus left in the position of creating a collage from numerous findings, collected in different places and at different times. Since few studies have utilized probability samples of the national populace, it is questionable how reliable available results are as estimates of the country's "true" patterns. The available studies lead us to suspect the existence of appreciable regional and ethnic differences in class-related behavior, but these sub-group variations have yet to be systematically documented.

Second, in order to compare findings across studies, it is important that the discrete groupings into which the study populations are divided be consistent. By and large, however, researchers have tended to dichotomize their study populations, the most common being "working/middle-class" or "blue/white collar" divisions. Even among studies which use the same gross dichotomy -- e.g., "working/middle-class" -- the cutting points utilized are often different, so that comparisons are difficult to make. It is obvious that this dichotomization and use of ordinal scales can lead to different interpretations of identical "raw" findings, since a change in the cutting point between groups can lead to a change in the observed percentage differences. A number of researchers have continuously stressed that variations in behavior are present within these groupings which should not be overlooked. Yet, for example, the typology suggested by S.M. Miller (1964) or W. Miller's (1958) characterization of the lower-class in terms of six "focal concerns" have not been rigorously tested.* In many instances, data are available from which to make finer distinctions, but because the samples are small, the authors collapse their categories and so obliterate finer points.

Third, most of the writers have been so impressed with the finding that socio-economic position (no matter how measured) is associated with a variety of dependent variables that they have generally not taken the further steps of assessing the strength or degrees of relationship or attempting to explain why such relationships are found. Few investigators have employed measures of association which allow the reader to assess how strongly a particular dependent variable is related to socio-economic status. As a consequence, descriptive statements usually lend themselves to somewhat exaggerated views of class differences. For example, the literature on "need achievement" contains findings which, when translated into correlation coefficients, are of the order of .2 - .4, but descriptive statements about the findings give the impression that there are strikingly different orientations to achievement by socio-economic status. To some extent to which these ambiguities in the literature have carried over into this paper.

Similarly, the finding that socio-economic status is correlated with some dependent variable is very infrequently followed up with either further empirical specification or speculation concerning the causal nexus between SES and the dependent variable in question. With the notable exceptions of Merton (1957) and Kriesberg (1963), who have attempted to work out rationales for class differences, most social scientists typically regard such findings as ultimate explanations requiring little further exploration. For example, the relationship between SES and tests of intellectual functioning has been documented for decades, yet only recently has one of the prior variables, i.e., linguistic development, been studied. The precise effects of some intervening variables, such as quality of education, are still unclear. We could, by drawing elaborate causal models based on numerous studies reconstruct some of these relationships, but the problems of samples and statistics would obstruct such an effort. Or, the inverse relationship between socio-economic status and divorce is well-documented, but with the exception of Goode's (1951,1966) explanation and the Moynihan report, few studies have set out to empirically study this relationship with a sample large enough to allow for the possibility that different mechanisms may be causing the relationship observed at different levels. A study of the structure and functioning of the Negro family in the United States, to the best of our knowledge, has not been published.* As a consequence of the research of the past few decades, we know a lot about what the differences are among socio-economic groups, but very little about why such differences exist.

---

*The study by Cohen and Hodges (1963) is a notable attempt to characterize the "lower-blue-collar" class and its differences from our groups; but even there, as the authors admit "the interpretations are post facto attempts to make sense of our data." Another example is the comparison of the child-rearing environment and family functioning of "upper-lower" and "very low-lower" class families by Pavenstedt (1965). The overall theoretical orientation of this study, however, was psychoanalytic, and the criteria for dividing families into the two groups do not lend themselves to replication.

Two additional problems were encountered, and not solved to our complete satisfaction: comparability of findings and the historical period which the studies cover. The research technology available to social scientists has grown rapidly in sophistication over the period surveyed; researchers in the mid-sixties have access to electronic computers, unavailable to the researcher of the fifties. More funds for research were available in the later period. Consequently, comparisons and juxtapositions of findings from different periods are fraught with danger. Furthermore, we have no way of assessing whether some of the findings reported at the start of our period are still relevant today, or conversely. Consequently, the reader is cautioned not to regard the empirical related in our analysis as holding for all times and places. For example, the political apathy of the poor is well documented, but under certain circumstances, such as the recent (1967) racial riots, politicization of the poor can occur.*

---

* E. Franklin Frazier's (1939) classic study is now more than thirty years old, and rests heavily on relatively slight research and is geared to a period in American Negro history which is now long past.

Who are the "poor"?:

In the current literature on the poor and in policy discussions, the definition of poverty is an unresolved problem. All agree that those living in poverty are persons and households which have considerably less than average access to goods and services and considerably less than average financial and other resources. There is no agreement, however, on where to draw the poverty line; that is, on what constitutes minimum adequacy, and secondarily on how many Americans can be considered "poor." This disagreement can be expected to continue indefinitely for two reasons: first, because no index and no cutting point will do everything that every party to the dispute would desire, and second, because social change will not acquiesce in the preservation of any index.**

---

* In this sense, Marx' characterization of the lumpenproletariat as, at best, politically inert, and at worst, counter-revolutionary was historically conditioned.

** Examples of these discussions can be found in Gordon (1965), Harrington (1962), Orshansky (1965), Anderson (1964), and Ferman, _et al_. (1965).

Part of the disagreement over the concepts of the "poor" and of "poverty" stems from the distinction, often implicit, made by many writers, between two types of poverty and of poor people. On the one hand, there are the "respectable" poor, persons who are just like standard middle-class Americans except that they have less income and wealth. On the other hand, there are the "disreputable" poor, those who not only have limited resources but also behave differently or hold values different from those of standard middle-class Americans. For example, Warner and his students (1949) distinguish a lower-lower class from an upper-lower class primarily on the basis of values and behavior.* Marx (1914) used the term "lumpenproletariat" to characterize the most disorganized and bestialized element of the working class. He predicted that the "lumpenproletariat" would be used by counter-revolutionary forces to oppose the righteous revolution of the working class.**

Contemporary discussions of the poor distinguish between those who, because of events of their life cycle or the chance happenings of disaster, "happen" to be suffering from a low level of income and wealth -- the aged, the sick, the disabled, the victims of economic dislocations -- and the "chronic" poor, those who are unable to "make a go of it" because of character deficiencies or lack of skill. It is the latter group upon which the greatest attention is centered. A set of terms has been filtering into the literature to characterize this group: "the new poor," "multi-problem families," the "new working class," "unstable families," "the culture of poverty," and so on. Other terms -- e.g., the "disreputable poor," and "paupers" -- have been refurbished, usually encased in quotation marks, presumably to indicate that they are being used without old-fashioned pejorative connotations. Note that all of these terms are used to imply that something more than income is missing in this group. They indicate that these are people who are poor and who cannot cope with their poverty despite their lack of any obvious physical and mental disabilities. These are people who "make noise," "cause trouble," and generally create "problems" for the rest of society.* The "poor" then, to whom the major amount of attention is addressed in the new literature on poverty are those whose income is low (excluding the disabled, the retired, and the temporarily poor), who are unanble to cope successfully even at a minimal level with their poverty, and who present problems to society. Although no single writer employs precisely this definition, we think it covers the essential features of most.**

---

* In Social Class in America, Warner distinguishes a "common man" level described by his respondents as "poor but respectable," "poor but honest," and "poor but hardworking," from a "below the common man level" described as "river rats," "peckerwoods," "dirty and immoral," and "those who live like pigs."

** In the 18th Brumaire, Marx writes: "Along with ruined roués of questionable means of support and questionable antecedents, along with foul and adventures-seeking dregs of the bourgeoisie, there were vagabonds, dismissed soldiers, discharged convicts, runaway galley slaves,...-- in short, the whole undefined, dissolute, kicked-about mass that the Frenchmen style 'la bohême.'"

There are two important distinctions of this definition: First, the definition stresses the non-economic aspects of poverty and hence is more in keeping with social policies which are directed at changing values and behavior than with policies which stress full employment and income maintenance. Second, it is a definition which easily becomes circular: the target population is defined as poor because they manifest certain characteristic problems; the problems are then explained as due to the fact that the target population is poor.

---

* As Matza (1966) points out, this is especially evident in the British term, "problem family," and the American adaptation, "multi-problem" family.

** Cohen, 1964; Engel, 1966; Harrington, 1962; O. Lewis, 1966; Lockwood, 1960; Matza, 1966; S.M. Miller, 1964a, 1964b; W.B. Miller, 1958, 1959; Pavenstedt, 1965; Riessman, 1962, 1964; and Schneiderman, 1964, 1965. Of these writers, S.M. Miller has attempted to elaborate a typology of the lower classes, distinguishing essentially between the "hopeless" poor and those who are attempting to cope with their problems.

This new literature which describes the specific characteristics of the "lower-lowers" (to use Warner's neutral term) tends to consist of case studies or qualitative field observations rather than extensive, quantitative, and systematic analyses of population characteristics. Perhaps because the literature is so meager there is considerable agreement among writers concerning specific characteristics which are manifested by the "lower-lowers." These features include:

1. Labor-Force Participation: Long periods of unemployment and/or very intermittent employment. Public assistance is frequently a major source of income for extended periods.

2. Occupational Participation: When employed, jobs held are at the lowest levels of skills -- e.g., domestic service, unskilled labor, menial service jobs, and farm labor.

3. Family and Interpersonal Relations: High rates of indices of marital instability (desertion, divorce, separation), high incidence of households headed by females, high rates of illegitimacy; unstable and superficial interpersonal relationships characterized by considerable suspicion of persons outside the immediate household.
4. Community Characteristics: Residential areas with very poorly developed voluntary associations and low levels of participation in such local voluntary associations as exist.
5. Relationship to Larger Society: Little interest in, or knowledge of, the larger society and its events; some degree of alienation

from the larger society.

6. Value Orientation: A sense of helplessness and low sense of personal efficacy; dogmatism and authoritarianism in political ideology; fundamentalist religious views with some strong inclinations toward beliefs in magical practices. Low 'need achievement' and low levels of aspirations for the self.

Although several other characteristics could be added to this inventory, our informal content analysis of the literature indicates that these characteristics are those over which there is considerable consensus and which tend to be stressed as critical features of the "lower-lowers."

Dissent among writers centers around three issues: first, there is the question of whether the "lower-lowers" are "happy" or not. Some writers extol the spontaneity of expression among this group while others ascribe the same phenomenon to lack of impulse control. Some see the poor as having a fine and warm sense of humor but others regard their humor as bitter and sad. Some claim that the poor are desperately trying to change their condition, sinking into apathy when it becomes clear to them that the odds are greatly against their being able to do so, others deny that a strong desire for change exists.

The second major point of disagreement arises over whether or not the "lower-lowers" have developed a contra-culture -- a rejection of the core values of American society -- or whether they are best characterized by what Hyman Rodman (1963) calls"value stretch," a condition in which the main values are accepted as valid, by persons, who, nonetheless, exempt themselves from fulfilling the requirement of norms.*

---

* As described in Rodman (1963), the concept of "value stretch" is a phenomenon not peculiar to the "lower-lowers." No normative system is adhered to completely by everyone in the society, and, depending upon the norms in question,

A third issue over which there is some disagreement concerns the extent to which the characteristics of the poor are "cultural" or "situational." From the point of view of some writers, many features of "lower-lower" life are passed on from generation to generation forming a "culture (or subculture) of poverty" which once started is as difficult to change as any other valid culture (O. Lewis, 1966; W.B. Miller, 1958). Other writers stress the situational determinants of these characteristics, indicating that they arise as accomodative responses to the conditions of poverty (Kriesberg, 1963; Rainwater, 1966). Obviously, this issue to some extent overlaps the second area of disagreement described above: a contra-culture is a subculture although a subculture need not necessarily be set up in opposition to the main cultural streams of a society.

Even if we had limited our discussion to those sets of characteristics about which minimal consensus exists, it would still be a major undertaking to draw a definitive portrait of the poor. The major reason for this difficulty is that the literature describing the "lower-lower" class does not provide us with information on the relative weights to be attributed to these characteristics. Thus, if we take the position that a person (or household) is to be counted as a member of the "lower-lower" group if and only if he manifests each and every one of the characteristics described above, then it is obvious that extremely small numbers of the population would fall into the group so defined. The addition of each characteristic necessarily restricts the eligible population, except where characteristics are very highly corre-

---

the latitude given for compliance can be considerable. For example, adultery has undoubtedly been widespread throughout the whole range of American social strata although there is clear evidence from attitude surveys that legitimate sexual alliances are to be preferred over adulterous ones. If there is any reason for the concept to be applied to the "lower-lowers" with more force than to any other group in American society, it is that their lives (for a variety of reasons) depart from standard American in more areas and more dramatically.

lated with each other. It is doubtful, however, whether such a rigorous definition of the poor is subscribed to by any one of the writers whose orientation we have discussed.

It seems more sensible to apply these defining characteristics according to some sort of scale. At the simplest level, the presence or absence of each characteristic can be weighted in deciding whether or not an individual or household is to be counted among the "lower-lowers." However, in this case, the critical question becomes what weight should be given to each of the characteristics, that is, which are the most essential characteristics, the absence or presence of which should more definitely determine whether or not an individual or household is to be a member of the "lower-lower" class.*

Although most of the writers have not been particularly clear on this point, we make the assumption that occupation is the sine qua non of the "lower-lowers." Hence, "lower-lower" characterizes persons or households whose main breadwinner is permanently unemployed and/or when employed, holds down occupations on the lowest skill and income levels. However, since, according to the literature, not all such persons should be considered members of the "lower-lower" class, persons in this group have to manifest some or all of the other characteristics described in order to be considered members of the "lower-lower" class.

In short, a person or household who is to be considered as a member of the "lower-lower" class displays certain occupational characteristics and also some (as yet unspecified) combination of behavioral or attitudinal characteristics.* Fortunately for the purposes of this paper, it was not necessary to come to grips fully with this question, since our main concern was with the general correlates of socio-economic position.

---

* Note that Warner bypasses this question entirely by defining membership in a particular class in terms of some sort of consensus in a community that the individual or household in question belongs in that class. (Warner, Social Class in America, 1949). Hence, his definition of the "lower-lowers" is perhaps the least subject to circularity, although the most difficult to apply in a given empirical situation.

The overview of our knowledge about the poor presented earlier in this volume, was derived from a synthesis of the empirical literature and a confrontation between these findings and the composite picture derived from the qualitative and impressionistic material just presented. If the differences shown in the empirical material between middle and working class were such that an extrapolation from them resulted in a prediction of "lower-lower" class behavior which is consistent with the descriptions provided in our composite portrait, then we would have some basis for inferring that the "lower-lower" class is not qualitatively different from the rest of society, but simply more extreme in these behaviors. On the other hand, if extrapolation from known differences had resulted in predictions which are inconsistent with our composite portrait, then we would have had reason to infer that the poor are indeed qualitatively different from the rest of the population. As argued above, however, our findings indicated that the major differences are quantitative, not qualitative.

It could be said that our strategy was deficient: on the one hand we placed a composite portrait based on non-systematic and impressionistic evidence and on the other hand confronted it with almost two decades of empirical research. Indeed, it may even be argued that this portrait is incorrect and that no conclusive inferences can be made. It is our belief, however, that given the current state of knowledge about the poor, our conclusion was the most reasonable. The question of the accuracy of our inferences and extrapolations cannot be resolved until the large-scale, quantitative studies of representative samples of the poor provide the necessary documentation.

---

* Obviously, this is not yet a workable definition, since the way in which these secondary characteristics are to be combined in an index or scale has yet to be specified. Exactly how some of the writers on the poor (see especially O. Lewis, 1966) come up with estimates of the proportion of the total population who are "lower-lower" or "living in the culture of poverty" is something of a mystery. We suspect that these estimates are arrived at by considering a combination of income and occupation, eliminating those who are "merely" poor by subtracting the old, disabled, and temporarily unemployed, leaving the residual as those "living in the culture of poverty."

The Correlates of Socio-Economic Status:

This part of the paper is a series of short stories, each covering a substantive area in which some social-class differentials have been found. In condensed form, these sections provide for the reader the "raw data" from which we have drawn many of our inferences about the poor in the United States. The synthesis attempted within each area will also provide a useful entry point for social-scientists, and proverbial intelligent laymen to the literature on social-class and poverty.

The classification system employed here attempts to be systematic, but is clearly not the cnly way these studies can be grouped. Some readers may find it useful to rearrange findings in what are analytically more useful ways. In the case of small studies or laboratory experiments, classification was not difficult and extracting the major finding an easy task. When we were confronted with large-scale national surveys, the problem was more difficult. In those cases, we have reported one or two relevant findings, and left the fuller richness of the SE materials to be investigated by the reader.

Both in the text itself, and in numerous footnotes we have indicated resources of additional information or corroborative studies. It should be remembered that the main reason for citing a study is not because it is an exemplar of empirical research but because it provides some evidence, no matter how precariously established, concerning socio-economic status and its correlates. We are aware of the fact that both our citations and bibliography may leave the reader with an enigma: namely, was that omitted material with which he is personally acquainted merely overlooked or considered inadequate for inclusion? We hope that the discussion of our method and some of the criteria for selection set forth in the preceding section will help resolve those issues.

A. Community Organization and Participation in Voluntary Associations:

The literature on poverty and the poor describes the areas inhabited by the "lower-lowers" as severely lacking in community organization; i.e., the voluntary associations usually found in many middle-class areas, whose purposes are to look after the collective interests and the commonweal of the area in question, are not present. Consequently, it is difficult to locate and negotiate with "indigenous" leaders who can legitimately speak for, and make committments on behalf of area inhabitants. Even those local voluntary associations which can be found, e.g., churches, social clubs, etc., tend to be concerned with their own particular affairs and not with the neighborhood coomunity or public interests in general.

This is not to imply that the areas occupied by the poor are socially disorganized. Whyte (1943) and Gans (1962) both demonstrate that individuals in the slums are connected to each other in complicated networks of peer and kinship groups. However, organizations concerned with community affairs, both internally and in dealing with the larger society, are relatively rare. Gans, for example, notes the relative helplessness of the people he studied to organize sufficiently to halt the redevelopment of their neighborhood.

So rare are those working class or "lower-lower" neighborhoods which do manage to achieve some degree of community organization that a great deal of attention has been paid to the few examples which exist. Alinsky's (1946) successful organization of the Back-of-the-Yards neighborhood of Chicago during the Thirties and his later, even more dramatic, organization of Woodlawn (Silberman, 1964) (a "lower-lower" Negro slum of Chicago), are prime examples of successful organization in types of areas usually characterized by its lack.*

Systematic studies directly touching upon the density of voluntary associations by areas are not frequent. Rossi (1956) studied four areas in Philadelphia and found, by canvassing voluntary associations in each area, that the two high-status areas had many more voluntary associations than the two low-status areas.** Glazer and Moynihan (1963) argue that the main difference which accounted for the rapid rise in social status of some immigrant groups (namely the Jews) and the relatively retarded rise of others (notably Italians, Negroes, and Irish) was the lack of voluntary mutual aid associations in areas occupied by the latter.

At the level of individual participation in voluntary associations, research findings are more plentiful. Hausknecht (1962) reanalyzed two national sample surveys and found participation in voluntary associations to be positively related to education, occupation, and income; although also related to stages in the life-cycle, with heaviest participation among the middle-aged. This study also concurs with our previous statements that not only do participation rates differ, but also the types of organizations to which lower-status individuals belong are different. Wright and Hyman (1958), present evidence from two national probability samples and a number of metropolitan area samples and find similar patterns, along with fairly strong ethnic and religious differences.*

---

* Other recent examples of concerted attempts to build community organization in unorganized, urban, lower-class areas are Mobilization for Youth, operating on New York's lower East Side, Haryou-Act in Harlem, and the various Community Action Programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity. A recently published book by Marris and Rein (1967) discusses the evolution of many of the recent programs, giving special attention to the philosophies behind them. Unfortunately, they do not present much information on the success or failure of the attempts to organize these areas.

** Note that neither low-status area would qualify as being primarily a "lower-lower" neighborhood.

Participation in specific voluntary associations also shows the same pattern of higher rates of membership and participation on the part of persons from higher socio-economic levels. Goode (1966) compares the religious behavior of two national samples (the first predominantly white, Protestant, rural, and blue-collar; the second a white, Congregationalist, urban, white-collar, and high-income sample) and finds that church participation (as measured by attendance, membership, and officeholding in church organizations) is positively associated with social status.** Greeley and Rossi (1966) find the same pattern among Roman Catholics with attendance at mass and the performance of ritual duties more frequent among higher-status Catholics. Demerath (1966) argues that there are differences among socio-economic levels in styles of relgious behavior with the higher levels being more committed to church organization and ritual, and lower status people being more concerned with devotion and "spirit." Goode (1966) suggests that for the middle class, church activity has become secularized so that it is an extension of overall associational participation; whereas for the lower class it is more intrinsically religious in character.

Participation in political activities is also inversely related to socio-economic levels. Matthews (1954) found that the socio-economic status of legislators on all levels was predominantly upper-middle class, with lawyers constituting a majority of Congressmen and Senators. Persons with working-class occupations were found very infrequently, and then only on local legislative bodies (e.g., city councils in small cities). In a review of a series of studies, Woodward and Roper (1950) found that lower-status individuals were much less likely to vote, belong to organizations which took stands on political issues, discuss political issues with their friends, write or talk to Congressmen or other public officials, contribute money to a political party or to a candidate, or attend meetings at which political speeches were made.

---

* Many other researchers working with smaller and less extensive samples report the same findings (e.g., Dotson, 1951; Reissman, 1954; Foskett, 1955).

** Goode's article contains references to a great many relevant studies dealing with various aspects of social class and church participation.

Studies of involvement in public decision making also reveal the same pattern. In a review of studies of participation in decision making, Bell, _et al_.(1961) find that working-class individuals are rarely implicated as playing direct or indirect roles in the making of public decisions. Strodtbeck, _et al_. (1965) found that even when lower-status individuals are brought into a decision-making situation as in the case of experimental juries, they tend to participate less in discussion, to be less often elected as jury foremen, and not to be regarded as contributing very much to the discussion by other participants.

The major studies of voting behavior conducted by the Survey Research Center of Michigan (Campbell, _et al_., 1960, 1966) as well as others* clearly document the lowered rates of participation in elections on the part of lower status individuals. Particularly important has been the finding that lower status persons have a lower sense of "political efficacy," i.e., they feel that their efforts directed towards influencing the outcome of political decision-making would not have any appreciable effect.

Finally, we turn to studies of participation in informal forms of social interaction. Rossi (1956) found that lower status individuals have fewer friends and are less likely to visit with relatives and neighbors, a finding also partly reported by Cohen and Hodges (1963).* King (1961), reviewing the results of four sociometric studies, showed that although individuals at all status levels tend to choose friends from one's own level, lower SES individuals also make unreciprocated upper-status choices. Curtis (1963) reports that lower-class individuals tend to associate more with individuals within their own socio-economic categories than do high-status individuals. In an analysis of social behavior, Muir and Weinstein (1962) find that lower SES families restrict socializing to their immediate families and neighbors, while higher SES individuals have a much broader range of friends and acquaintances.

---

* See Lipset, _et al_., (1954) for a review of major voting studies.

B. Morbidity, Mortality, and the Utilization of Medical Services:

Nineteenth and early twentieth-century descriptions of the poor heavily stress the higher incidence of physical illnesses among the poor and their relatively short life span. Indeed, the major emphasis of the public health movement (Simmons, 1958) was on eliminating those conditions which sustained the lowered chances of life of the poor. The success of the public health movement, coupled with the sharp rise in standards of living, has significantly lowered the incidence of illness and raised the average life expectancy of the total population.

In a review article, Kadushin (1964) argues that socio-economic differentials in the incidence of disease were almost eliminated by the post-World War II period, and refers to ten studies which he feels substantiate his position. Recently, Antonovsky (1967) raised some strong objections to this argument, although granting that there is merit in Kadushin's suggestion that there are intervening variables between social class and disease. In reexamining the studies cited by Kadushin, Antonovsky concludes that only a study by Graham (1958) supports Kadushin's hypothesis. The studies that we have found, in addition to those discussed in the debate, present a mixed picture. Thus, Mayer and Hauser (1950) analyzed life tables for Chicago for the period 1920-1940 and showed that expectations of life at birth for racial and socio-economic groups converged during this period, although substantial differences remained between whites and non-whites. Ellis (1958), in an analysis of mortality records for 1949-1951 for the city of Houston, Texas, also finds mortality rates inversely related to socio-economic status with the major differences between the lowest SES group and others, and particularly high death rates in this group from chronic diseases. In a unique study of the interaction over time between illness and socio-economic status, Lawrence (1958) examined the prevalence of illness in a sample of 1,310 families in 1923 and 1943 and found an inverse relationship in both periods. However, the data indicate that chronic illness may be more significant as a factor in reducing socio-economic status than as a consequence of status.

---

* Cohen and Hodges report that lower-class respondents say that they interact more with kin both absolutely and also relative to their interaction with neighbors, friends from work, and friends they have met elsewhere.

In a review article of the social and cultural factors involved in infant mortality, Anderson (1958) concludes that when the gross relationships of infant mortality and various social factors are examined, there is a negative correlation between social status and infant mortality rates; however, "the nearer the infant mortality rate approaches a virtually irreducible minimum in terms of our present knowledge, the less operative are the social and environmental factors and the more operative are so-called 'maternal efficiency,' 'copability,' and other personal factors (p. 23)." Two more studies dealing with SES and infant mortality bear out Anderson's statement: Stockwell (1962), in a study of neonatal mortality in Providence for 1949-1951, found that there was not very much difference between class levels except for deaths in the post-neonatal period (after one month) at which point the lower socio-economic levels had higher rates due to infectious diseases and accidental deaths. Willie (1959), in a similar study in Syracuse, also finds very little difference in neonatal deaths by SES.

Graham (1963) in a review of studies of chronic illness finds a confusing and irregular pattern of relationships to socio-economic levels. For example, some studies show that hypertension is positively related to SES while others show a negative relationship; or, that cancers atdifferent body sites relate differently to SES.

Statistics from the U.S. National Health Survey, 1962-1963, showing the number of days of disability according to income class from below $2000 to $7000 were divided into "restricted activity days per person," "bed disability days per person," "days in hospital per hospitalized person," and "days of work-loss due to injury per usually working person." These statistics reveal that in all four income categories the percentages are higher for those earning below $2000.*

The report indicates that:

> " 1. Rates of disability days are inversely related to the amount of family income, even with adjustment for differences in the age distribution within income intervals.
>
> 2. Based on unadjusted data, a person with family income of less than $2000 has, on the average, 16 days more of restricted activity than a person with an income of $7000 or more. Comparable differentials were seven additional days of bed disability and four days more lost from work. The rate of days lost from school was fairly constant for all income levels.
>
> 3. The number of disability days attributable to chronic illness and impairment was highest among persons with family income of less than $2000 and decreased consistently with higher amounts of income. Disability days associated with acute

---

* U.S. National Center for Health Statistics, Medical care, health status, and family income. Washington: Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, 1964 (Series 10, No. 9).

> illness or injury remained fairly constant regardless of amount of family income. The relatively higher rate of disability days due to chronic illness in the lowest income group is influenced to some extent by the comparatively high proportion of older persons in this group (p.74)."

It is important to note, however, that the above findings discuss income, and that most of the empirical work discussed earlier considers composite measures of social status.

Studies reporting socio-economic differences in the utilization of medical services are more consistent in their findings: Ross (1962), reanalyzing data from the National Health Surveys for 1957-1959, found a direct relationship between the average number of visits to physicians and social class. When the visits are analyzed in terms of the type of service that was received from the physician, the findings indicate that upper class persons were more likely to be going for preventive services while lower class persons mainly go to the doctor due to some acute complaint. Kriesberg and Treiman (1960) found similar tendencies with respect to utilization of dental services in a national sample of 1,862 respondents. Graham (1958) also reports that in the same county in which there are no discernible class differences in illness, 58 per cent of the highest status respondents had consulted a physician during the study period, while only 40 per cent of the lowest status group had done so. Laughton _et. al_., (1958), in an analysis of the records of a small sample (N=105) of families participating in a prepaid medical care plan in Canada, found that class differences in the utilization of services were not statistically significant. They suggest that under conditions where financial factors are not important, class differences in the utilization of medical services tend to disappear.*

Kadushin (1964), in the review noted earlier, also hypothesizes that lower class persons are more concerned about illness and experience feeling ill more frequently than upper class persons. The greater concern over illness expressed by low SES persons stems from their lesser knowledge of medicine, and the greater consequences of disease for their lives. The greater fear of both medicine and the consequences of disease leads to less utilization of medical services. We did find shreds of evidence to support the greater anxiety and lack of knowledge about illness which Kadushin suggests: Deasy (1956) found in a study of the mother (130) of second-grade children participating in field trials of a polio vaccine that lower SES mothers were less likely to allow their children to participate and less likely to know the purposes of the field trial. Ossenberg (1962), in a study of 75 patients hospitalized for similar disorders, found that lower status patients were more anxious about their illnesses, less resigned to their illnesses, and more inclined to procrastinate in seeking medical help than high status patients.* Levine (1962), controlling for the adequacy of local medical facilities, shows that lower class persons are more fearful of serious disease. Jenkins (1966) reports from a study of 436 respondents in a Florida community that Negro respondents, perceiving a greater prevalence of tuberculosis than whites, were much more concerned about tuberculosis.

---

* Laughton's sample, however, is not representative of the socio-economic continuum, since membership in a prepaid medical plan is often contingent on regular employment and/or enough funds to maintain monthly payments.

In sum, the data presented above leads us to agree with Antonovsky's (1967) conclusions:

> " There have doubtless been major changes during the twentieth century in the extent to which there are class differences in the traditional intervening variables -- Malthus' 'vice and misery' -- which linked class to disease. But...the data are far from conclusive in demonstrating the disappearance of class differences in disease. "

---

* In this study, the findings cannot be accounted for by economic factors, since most of the lower class patients were on welfare relief and payments were not discontinued during hospitalization; moreover, their hospital expenses were covered.

We might add to this that in the utilization of medical services the existence of class differences is very marked.

C. Delinquency:

The observation that the lower SES levels contribute more than their proportionate share to juvenile delinquency and adult criminality is firm enough to require little further documentation. However, it is necessary to keep in mind that in the statistics usually cited, delinquency and criminality are defined by actions taken by the law enforcement agencies, processes which offer many points at which selective treatment can enter. In short, no one knows the true rates of criminal or delinquent acts, although the recorded rates indicate that there is an inverse relationship to socio-economic status.

The possible disparity between true and known rates of delinquent and criminal acts is well illustrated by the course of research over the past decade on juvenile delinquency. A number of macroscopic studies on officially recorded delinquents show the expected inverse relationship to socio-economic status. Lander's (1954) Baltimore study of over 8,000 cases of recorded delinquency and Bordua's (1958-1959) Detroit study both found that economic factors were important in urban areas having high delinquency rates. More recently, Chilton (1964) reported a reanalysis of the Lander and Bordua data, as well as a comparison of the two earlier studies with data from 1,649 delinquent cases in Indianapolis. He concluded that delinquency in urban areas is related to transciency, poor housing, and economic indices, and is predominantly a lower class male phenomenon.

Reiss and Rhodes (1961) in a study of 9,238 boys in Nashville, Tennessee, searched juvenile court records to locate delinquent respondents in the sample. They found the usual inverse relationship between SES and delinquency; furthermore, lower status boys are more likely to have been charged with more serious delinquent acts, and upper status boys are more likely to have informal records on their activities rather than formal citations.*

However, when adolescents themselves are asked whether or not they have committed one or more of a set of delinquent acts, the inverse relationship to SES lessens or disappears. Nye, Short, and Olsen (1958) in a study in three Washington cities and three midwestern towns, using a sample of fourteen and fifteen year olds, found virtually no differences by social class in the amount of self-reported delinquent behavior.** A replication by Akers (1964), conducted in a middle-sized Ohio city and using a sample of 9th grade students, found the same results. A lack of differences by social class is also reported by Clark and Wenninger (1962) in research from four Illinois communities for sixth to twelfth grade children and by Dentler and Monroe (1961) for seventh and eighth grade students in three Kansas counties. A study conducted by Voss (1966) in Honolulu did find a significant positive association between self-reported delinquency and social class for boys, but the association disappears when delinquency is redefined as the reporting of two or more serious delinquent behaviors. Voss found no relationship between delinquency and social class for girls in the study. In sum, these five studies of self-reported delinquency, conducted in fifteen communities, question whether there is a true inverse relationship between social status and delinquent behavior.

---

* Similar findings, gleaned from official records are reported by Bates (1960,1962), Palmore (1963), Palmore and Hammond (1964), Erickson, et al.(1965), and Gold (1966).

** They report that only 33 of the 756 tests of differences reach a five per cent significance level; these few differences can certainly be regarded as spurious.

There are two equally plausible ways of explaining these contradictions: first, the findings may indicate that there are severe differences in the way in which law enforcement agencies handle delinquent acts committed by children from different class levels. A second explanation is that either middle class children are exaggerating their delinquent acts or that lower class children are under-reporting theirs. It is obviously hard to choose among these alternatives. Perhaps it is most judicious to simply state that these findings indicate that there are probably SES differences in the commission of delinquent acts as well as differential treatment of apprehended delinquents by law enforcement agencies.

To date only fragmentary evidence exists to support the position that both explanations may indeed be plausible; Gold (1966) reports findings from a study of teenagers in Flint, Michigan, which included interviews designed to detect delinquency, the use of informants to validate some of the reported delinquent behavior, and a comparison of the data with police records (N=522, validation was possible in 125 cases). The findings indicate that an inverse relationship between social status and delinquency does exist for boys, but not for girls; that many serious delinquent acts are undetected; and that definite biases do exist in the police records. The police were more likely to officially record offenses committed by lower status youngsters, and more likely to "handle" the matter unofficially without referring it to the court if the offender came from a higher status family. From the official records, boys from the lowest social strata were apprehended five times as often as boys from the highest. Gold estimates that if records were complete and unselective, the ratio would be closer to 1.5:1. However, the interview data also indicates that, graded on an index of seriousness of offense, boys from the lowest strata were implicated on the highest delinquency level three to four times more than boys from the highest strata. "If we consider these boys to be ones who represent the most pressing social problem and therefore should be apprehended and given attention, then the official bookings rates do not depart so far from truly representing differential delinquency among social status levels (Gold, 1966, p. 44)."*

Concerning criminal acts committed by adults,** no comparable information is available. Among imprisoned criminals, the lowest economic groups tend to be disproportionately represented; prisoners are generally poorly educated, unemployed, unmarried and have a prior criminal record. We do not know whether such differentials would be markedly decreased were one to employ the same sort of self-reporting device with adults that Nye and others have used with youths or the interview procedure developed by Gold.

Thus far, we have dealt with those who commit crimes. Delinquent and criminal acts, however, can also be viewed in terms of the victims of crime. Some findings from a study conducted by NORC for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (Ennis, 1967) are of particular interest in this context: At all levels of income, Negroes have higher rates of victimization for serious crimes against the person compared to whites.

---

* An observational study of police officers' contacts with juveniles is reported by Piliavin and Briar (1964). The study suggests that wide discretion is exercised by police in dealing with young offenders and that this discretion is affected by criteria such as boys' prior records, race, grooming, and demeanor. When law enforcement agencies are evaluated by adolescents, one limited study (Chapman, 1956) finds that delinquent and non-delinquent respondents do not differ in their attitudes toward juvenile courts, probation agencies, and reformatories; but that the delinquent respondents show significantly greater antagonism toward the police.

** Characteristics of prisoners are tabulated in U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Inmates of Institutions. Final Report PC(2)-8A. Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1963.

For both groups, larcenies and car thefts increase with income. Burglaries, however, decline with a rise of income for whites, but increase for Negroes. When both serious and non-serious crimes against persons and property are tabulated, we find that low-income groups are more likely than high-income groups to be victims of crimes against the person, and that among the low-income group, Negroes are more often victimized than whites. Low-income groups of both races and high-income whites have similar victimization rates in property crimes, with high-income Negroes being twice as likely to be victims of such crimes.

D. Sexual Behavior, Fertility, and Family Stability:

Description of the "lower-lower" and cognate groups stress the "immorality" and instability of family life. O. Lewis' (1966) long and intensive description of a Puerto Rican family living in the "culture of poverty," seemingly devotes more space to these two topics than to almost any other. Similarly, Moynihan (1967) is particularly concerned with the stability of family life, and the incidence of illegitimacy among Negroes in the 1960's. Warner's (1949a, 1949b) informants frequently refer to the theme of immorality in their descriptions of the "lower-lower" class. Both Dollard (1937) and Powdermaker (1939) in studies of a Mississippi city, see sexual behavior and family stability as marking off distinct classes within the Negro caste.

Empirical studies tend to bear out the qualitative descriptions. Kinsey's (1948, 1953) now classic studies of human sexual behavior are the best large-scale studies available. Kinsey's samples, methodology, and interpretation have been criticized; certainly, the studies are biased by self-selection of respondent, under-representation of low-income groups, inclusion of prison populations, and reliance upon memory and recall.* Kinsey reports that for both males and females, the amount of education is more closely related to sexual behavior than any other social characteristic. He reports a sharp and consistent relationship between education and sexual activity among males: whether we consider age at first premarital intercourse, percentage involved at a given age level, the frequency of premarital intercourse, or extramarital behavior, the less educated are the most sexually active. For females, the incidence and frequency of premarital intercourse is greater among lower status families, but the relationship becomes less pronounced with age.

More systematic sample survey studies tend to corroborate Kinsey's findings. Reiss (1965) administered a scale of sexual permissiveness to a national sample of adults (N=1515) and to several samples of high-school and college students. He found no association between social class and permissiveness among the students, and a weak curvilinear association among adults; the lowest socio-economic groups tended to be more permissive than the high status group (gamma=.13 in the adult sample). Rainwater and Weinstein (1960), in their study of a small group (N=96) of upper-lower and lower-lower families in Chicago, found that the lower-lower group tended to have sexual intercourse more frequently, but to have relatively prudish attitudes towards sexual experiences and only crude notions of the physiology of sex.

Several summary reviews of the relationship between socio-economic status and fertility (Westoff, 1954; Jaffe, 1965; and K. Davis, 1965) indicate an inverse relationship, although status differentials have been decreasing over time. Jaffe (1965), reviewing studies of desired family size, finds that there are very little differences between socio-economic levels in the range and averages of desired family sizes. The poor, he concludes, get more children because they are not very proficient in avoiding excess fertility. Rainwater and Weinstein (1960) suggest that lower-lower couples have more children than they want because they have little faith in their own abilities to master contraceptive techniques, coupled with an inadequate knowledge of the physiology of conception.* The uneven spread of contraceptive knowledge can be documented with many studies showing that the higher the SES the greater the use of contraceptives both in terms of sheer usage and effectiveness of use (i.e., in the sense of controlling both number and spacing of children).**

---

* Some of the criticisms and evaluations of the Kinsey reports are contained in Himeloch and Fava (1955).

The extent to which both sexual practices and lack of contraceptive techniques influence the illegitimacy rates is difficult to evaluate. Official illegitimacy rates, as Moynihan (1967) has shown, are higher for low socio-economic status groups and especially high for Negroes. Vincent (1954), who studied private practitioners and institutions catering to unwed mothers, found that upper status women were more likely to have illegitimate children delivered by private practitioners; therefore, he questioned whether socio-economic differences in the illegitimacy rates are as large as official statistics indicate.

Studies of marital satisfaction also find inverse relationships with socio-economic status. The major empirical studies of marriage until as recently as 1957 dealt primarily with middle class and college-educated segments of the population; there is almost no research, before that date, which could be considered representative of the entire population (Landis, 1957). However, recent studies (Rainwater, _et al_., 1959; Gurin, Veroff, and Feld, 1960; Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Komarovsky, 1962; Bradburn, 1965;

---

* It should be noted that this finding antedates the development of birth control pills and the renewal of interest in the intra-uterine rings.

** See, for example, the studies in Kiser (1962) and the book by Freedman, _et al_., (1959).

Orden and Bradburn, 1968) have been based on more representative samples. Gurin, et. al. (1960), analyzing a national sample, and Bradburn (1965) working with samples in metropolitan areas, find that low SES couples are more likely to report dissatisfaction with their marriage. Orden and Bradburn (1968) find that the strength of the relationship between self-assessments of happiness in marriage, the scales constructed in the study to measure marital satisfactions and tensions and socio-economic status are about the same. Both indicators are positively related to SES, and the relationship is stronger for women than for men in both cases. Of special interest to us is the finding by Roth and Peck (1951)* that marital adjustment of couples is unrelated to their parents' SES, and their suggestion that the source of the relationship between adjustment and SES lies in the present circumstances of the couple studied.**

In reviewing studies of marital instability, both Hollingshead (1950) and Goode (1951) find an inverse relationship to SES. Goode suggests a process in which strain leads to dissatisfaction on the part of the wife who responds with withdrawal from intimacy and an eventual breakup of the marriage. A more recent cross-cultural analysis by Goode (1966) finds that the inverse relationship between divorce and socio-economic status holds for advanced industrialized societies in which divorce is relatively easy and inexpensive, but not for societies low in economic advancement or in which divorce is difficult or expensive. In a re-analysis of the 1960 Census, Udry (1966) finds that non-whites are much more likely to report themselves as separated or divorced than whites. When status is measured by educational level, an inverse relationship is found between separation /divorce and status for both men and women and for both whites and non-whites. When status is measured by occupation, the inverse relationship still holds for men (clearer for the non-whites than for whites); for females, the distribution by occupation is not patterned, except that non-white rates are higher.

---

* Roth and Peck re-analyzed Burgess' longitudinal study of 53 couples engaged to be married in the Thirties; "good" adjustment ranges from a high of 52% in the highest SES group to 12.5% in the lowest.

** We have omitted discussion of the quality and form of lower-class marriages in our discussion, as well as the sources of satisfaction and strain. The reader should consult the intensive studies of Komarovsky (1964), Pavenstedt (1965), Rainwater, et. al., (1959), and Cohen and Hodges (1963).

The literature discussed in this section, yields results of an uncertain character. It should be kept in mind that we have dealt with tendencies, and not with absolutes. At any one point in time, most of the households in the general population and among the poor are intact, with both husband and wife present. The poor have more dissatisfaction, more divorces, etc., but the reasons for these tendencies are not completely understood.

E. Parent-Child Relationships and Child-Rearing Practices:

Our survey indicates that more research has been conducted on social class differentials in the area of parent-child relationships and child-rearing practices than in any other area of sociology. This emphasis arises out of a particular view of the problems of the lower class as being due primarily to deficiencies of character. If character formation is the result of early childhoood experiences and orientations, then it is imperative that we specify ways in which the lower class and (more recently) the very poor differ from standard Americans (i.e., middle class) in their child-rearing practices. Yet there is by no means strong consensus on what precisely are standard middle class, working class, and lower class practices.

The early research of Davis and Havighurst (1946), studying a Chicago sample in 1943, found the working class more permissive than the middle class in a number of areas. Later research, conducted in Boston in 1951-1952, by Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957), found opposite class differences. Bronfenbrenner's review of numerous studies, covering the period 1930-1957, attempts to reconcile the differences among studies by postulating a historical shift in child rearing towards greater permissiveness, with the middle class showing greater changes than the working class.* Reasoning that the middle class is more attentive and responsive to agents of change (e.g., popular literature, physicians, and counselors), Bronfenbrenner sees the middle class as changing sufficiently since the Thirties to become, in the post World War II period, more permissive than the working class. Other class differences established in his review include a greater stress on independence training among the middle class, lessened use of corporal punishment, and less emphasis on authority as the basis for demands of obedience.

Research conducted since Bronfenbrenner's review has tended to emphasize parental values and attitudes toward child-rearing practices, rather than techniques per se.** Kohn (1959a, 1959b, 1963) suggests that techniques may have changed, while child-rearing values have remained much the same over time. The main differences in values between middle class and working class parents has been the former's concern with developing self-direction in their children and the latter's concern with conformity to external proscription. Thus, the working class stresses obedience, deference to persons of higher status, honesty, cleanliness, respectability, while the middle class has been concerned with the internalization of rules and norms, rather than the rules and norms themselves.* Swinehart (1963) reports that middle class mothers stress the development of morality and character and feel effective in handling children's social and emotional needs, while lower class mothers are more concerned with the physical needs of their children. Similarly, Gurin, _et al._ (1960) report that higher status parents are more concerned with the child-parent relationship, more introspective about their parental role; while lower status parents are more concerned over the provision of adequate physical care and material goods for their children. Kantor, _et al._ (1958) suggest that as one moves from lower to upper socio-economic levels, mothers express greater clarity and certainty in their views concerning discipline and sex, and are less concerned with obedience to parents. In an experimental setting, the results from the work of Hess and Shipman (1966a, 1966b) show that the lower the class level the more likely the mother is to emphasize obedience from her children, and the less likely to explain reasons for behavioral rules.

---

* For a description of the samples utilized in his review, see Bronfenbrenner (1966), Table I, p. 364. The major studies discussed are Davis and Havighurst, 1946; Klatskin, 1952; Sears, et. al., 1957; D.R.Miller and Swanson, 1958; White, 1957; Boek, et. al., 1958; Littman, et. al., 1957; and Kohn, 1959a.

** A discussion of the methodology used in the child-rearing studies and some criticism of the findings is presented by Johnsen and Leslie (1965).

The research reported above ascertained class differences by focusing on parents; a number of investigators, however, have attempted to detect differences through the study of adolescents. For example, in a large study (N=1472), Nye (1951) found that socio-economic level is a significant variable in the differential adjustment of adolescents to parents; with adolescents from high SES homes, better adjusted to their parents than those in low SES homes. Elder (1962) reports that middle class parents are viewed by adolescents as more likely to be democratic, egalitarian, or permissive; whereas lower class parents are likely to be considered autocratic or authoritarian. Bowerman (1964) reports that middle class parents are more often described as supportive and encouraging than are lower class parents.

---

* A recent replication of the Kohn study suggests that occupation is related to parental values in much the same ways in both the United States and Italy (Pearlin and Kohn, 1966).

A number of studies have focused on the "lower-lower" families: Wortis, _et al_. (1963), in a study of 250 Negro mothers from very poor households, found that they were more concerned with their own convenience than with a "good" theory of child care: they were more punitive than other groups, less demanding of performace and not very rewarding of children's accomplishments. Pavenstedt (1965) presents a distressing portrait of a group of "multi-problem" families whose cooperation was sought in sending their children to pre-nursery school. The mothers were reluctant to cooperate and harbored mistrust and suspicion of the school personnel. The children appeared to be neglected, hardly communicated with by adults, and characterized by a low level of affect and considerable self-devaluation. These findings are supported by Keller (1963) in a study of forty-six 5th-grade children from very poor families in New York. These children have derogatory self-images and little communication with adult members of their families. They were best described as living in an intellectually and emotionally impoverished environment.*

We note, however, that a much more optimistic picture of poor families is presented in the Child Rearing Study of Low-Income Families in Washington, D.C. On the basis of intensive study of sixty-six families, the majority of whom are very low income, H. Lewis (1965) and Jackson (1966) conclude that the child-rearing values of this group do not differ very much from those of middle class Americans. However, because of the problems which extreme poverty presents, their attention is mainly devoted to the high-priority items of food, clothing, and shelter, with consequent seeming neglect of their children.* The very poor tend to get bogged down in the frustrations of pursuing these high-priority items, and have little energy or desire left to provide a supportive and stimulating environment for their children.

---

* For a discussion of the lower class family, see Keller (1966). Extensive documentation of some of the issues discussed in this section is to be found in Berelson and Steiner (1964) and Hoffman and Hoffman (1964).

F. Need for Achievement, Level of Aspiration, and Work Satisfaction:

Since jobs and occupations play a central role in almost every definition of socio-economic status, the variables grouped together in this section are of prime theoretical importance. Need for achievement is presumably a measure of the strength of individual motivation to achieve some degree of success in the occupational sphere. Levels of aspiration refer to the professed occupational destinations of young people (or held by parents for their children). Finally, work satisfaction can be seen as one of the rewards of occupational position, and hence one of the incentives for remaining in the labor force.

The concept of achievement motivation and a recognized measure thereof using the TAT was developed by McClelland and his associates in experimental laboratory studies, usually with college students as subjects.** The importance of achievement motive lies in the central role given to it by McClelland, *et al.*, in social change and in individual mobility. Highly motivated individuals are presumed to show persistent striving activity directed toward a high goal in some area involving competition with a standard of excellence. Standards of excellence are first imparted to indiviuals by their parents, but in time these standards become internalized. A number of studies found a positive relationship between n Achievement and socio-economic status: an early study by Douvan (1956), using a sample of high-school students (N=313) in a Midwestern community, found that middle class adolescents manifest higher n Achievement than working-class individuals. Rosen (1956), in a study of high-school sophomores in the New Haven area, showed a clear relationship between social position and motivation scores, e.g., 83% of the subjects in the highest social class have high scores, as compared with 23% in the lowest. In a later study, Rosen (1959) examines differences in motivation, values, and aspirations of six racial and ethnic groups (427 pairs of mothers and their sons) in four Northeastern states. He finds that although there are significant differences by religion and ethnicity, social class accounts for more of the variance in motivation scores than either, and (as before) that social class is positively related to high achievement scores. Finally, Morgan (1962) reports the results from a national probability sample and shows that the n Achievement is higher for those respondents whose fathers were better educated, in white-collar occupations, and lived in large cities in the Northeast.*

---

* Epstein (1961) presents documentation, based on Census and information from the National Health Survey and Public Health Service, showing that the milieu of the child of a low income family comprises improper food, overcrowded living conditions, and lack of preventive dental and medical care.

** McClelland, *et al.* (1953). A recent book edited by Atkinson and Feather (1966) presents the theory of achievement motivation and the studies conducted since 1957 which provide the main body of evidence for the validity of its behavioral implications.

Recently, Kahl (1965) has suggested that distinctions ought to be made between achievement motivation and achievement goals, and presents data to buttress his case. Support for the argument presented by Kahl is reported in a study by Scanzoni (1967) who concludes that basic orientations toward occupations success may not necessarily vary by social class, but that "due to the structural situation of the lower and working classes, occupational achievement and mobility are less often defined as realistic. This gap (anomie) between aspirations and expectations in many cases exists wholly apart from particular methods of child-rearing and resultant personality development. Instead, limited occupational achievement appears to be (in part at least) the product of the limited purview of opportunity inherent within the lower classes (p. 456)."

---

* The data is drawn from a study of the determinants of income and of intergenerational changes (Morgan, et al., 1962).

Closely related to achievement-motive studies is the research focused on the "deferred gratification pattern" (DGP), a concept developed by Davis and Dollard (1940) to characterize the differences between middle class and lower class Negroes' ability to defer immediate gratification for long-term return. The major empirical study, conducted by Schneider and Lysgaard (1953), involved the completion of self-administered questionnaires by a national sample of 2,500 high-school students. They conclude that middle class students are more likely than lower class students to defer gratification by "impulse renunciation." Although the magnitude of the differences is not impressive, lower class "impulse following" non-DGP behavior includes willingness to engage in physical violence, limited pursuit of education, low aspiration level, free spending, lack of concern for courtesy and obedience and limited dependence on parents. A number of other studies have tried to specify the components of the DGP (Beilin, 1956; Straus, 1962; Mischel, 1958), but the results have not provided unequivocal support for the existence of the pattern.

Miller, Riessman, and Seagull (1965) have reviewed and criticized various aspects of these studies. For example, in the case of spending behavior, they suggest that the general life situation of the middle class makes it easier to defer gratification. The immediate spending of a lower class youth may simply be an attempt to bring himself up to the same level of consumption as shown by his middle class counterpart. Or, in the case of limited pursuit of education, the critics do not deny that class differences exist in attitude, dropout rates, and college attendance, but feel that "One must be cautious, however, in ascribing a solitary motivation to a particular behavior, since individuals may react in an identical manner for very different reasons (op. cit., p. 294)." Miller, et al., conclude that a final verdict on the DGP cannot be made at present, and that more attention should be paid to the situational rather than the psychodynamic variables involved in these behaviors.

The relatively small number of studies concerning the relationship between socio-economic status and achievement motive and/or DGP is surprising in the light of the considerable attention paid to these two topics in the literature on social stratification and poverty. In contrast, scores of studies are available on educational and occupational aspirations of youths.* The research designs and the sample sizes of these studies tend to be of a better quality than the material available on achievement motive and DGP.

Educational and occupational aspirations have been typically studied by asking high-school students their ultimate educational goals (e.g., whether they intend to attend college or not) and by asking for an occupational choice. In an extensive study of 35,000 seniors, from a national sample of 500 public high schools, Michael (1961) finds that social class, scholastic ability, and "school climate"** predicted intended college attendance rates. In the upper half of the ability distribution, social class remains the best predictor of a student's capacity to [illegible] in the top quarter of the ability distribution. An earlier study by Sewell, et al. (1957) of a random sample of Wisconsin high-school students (N=4,167) found that measured intelligence and social status each make an independent contribution to educational and occupational aspirations. With some modifications, and smaller, less comprehensive samples, the influence of social class on aspirations has been reported by Wilson (1959), Turner (1962), Krauss (1964), and Bennett and Gist (1964).

---

* Our coverage of the literature in this area is, by necessity, incomplete. To wit, a research team at Texas A&M University has published a bibliography of works on educational and occupational aspirations, including unpublished material, which contains over 500 items (Ohlendorf, et al., 1967).

** School climates are ordinarily indexed by the proportion of the student body exhibiting various social and personal characteristics, such as the proportion of students from highly educated families, or the proportion of students planning to go on for further education.

Antonovsky and Lerner (1959)in a study of youths between the ages of 16-20, paid particular attention to the educational and vocational aspirations of Negro and whites youths of the same socio-economic level. They found that Negroes tend to have higher aspirations than whites.* Similar results were obtained by Short and Strodtbeck (1965) in a study contrasting gang members with other youths of comparable social status in Chicago.** In a comparison of four Chicago samples and two national samples, Rivera and Short (1967) make the distinction between absolute and relative occupational expectations.*** When looking at absolute goals, they find that non-gang lower class Negroes expect to reach higher occupational levels than non-gang whites; with race controlled, the expectations of gang members are lower than those of non-gang members. The findings from the national sample indicate no difference in the absolute goals of Negroes and whites. However, when relative expectations are compared, they find that within all comparable categories Negroes anticipate a substantially greater amount of upward mobility than whites, i.e., the expectations of Negro gang members are higher than those of white gang members; the expectations of the Negro national sample are higher than those of the white national sample.

---

* The higher educational aspirations of Negro high school students are also detected in a study conducted in Kansas City by Gist and Bennett (1963).

** Many researchers comment on the unreasonably high aspirations of Negro youths: for example, one high-school dropout in Short and Strodtbeck's study indicated that he wanted to be a doctor. Oscar Lewis (1965) catches the flavor of these unrealistically high expectations in a quotation from a nine-year-old Puerto Rican girl who states in the context of explaining how much she loves her mother, "That's why when I grow up I want to be a doctor or a chambermaid. So when I work and earn money, I'll put it in the bank and give mami the bank book so she can take out what she wants" (p. 246). Note that the second sentence in the quotation shows both the DGP (putting money earned in the bank) and impulse gratification (letting her mother take out money whenever she needs it).

*** These distinctions are made by Empey (1956). Absolute goals refer to the occupational level an adolescent defines as attainable; relative goals specify the amount of mobility beyond status of origin which a respondent expects to achieve.

As could be anticipated, parental aspirations for children follow much the same pattern suggested above. Hyman (1966), reviewing national sample survey results, found that parents' educational and occupational aspirations for their children are directly related to socio-economic status.* Working with a less extensive sample, R.R. Bell (1965), found a direct relationship between socio-economic status and Negro mothers' educational aspirations for their children. In Rosen's work (1959), social class is also significantly and directly related to vocational aspirations; however, ethnicity accounts for more of the variance than social class. With the exception of the study by Reissman (1953), the aspirations of adults across social classes have not been investigated. In an Evanston, Illinois, study, Reissman found that upper status respondents were much more willing to forego immediate gains in order to obtain occupational advancement.** Finally, in a cross-cultural comparison of the occupational aspirations of young boys, Lambert and Klineberg (1963) found that the aforementioned socio-economic differentials in aspirations hold, although there were some differences among countries in the kinds of occupations desired.

---

* Studies by G.D. Bell (1963) and Simpson (1962) report similar findings; these studies also suggest that parental motivation, as perceived by high-school students, may be more important than social class as a predictor of high ambition.

** It is also possible to interpret the findings of this study in terms of the deferred gratification pattern discussed above.

The difficulty in the interpretation of the findings from aspiration studies has been recognized by many writers. Once goals are elicited, it is often difficult to interpret whether they are aspirations or whether the responses reflect a combination of realizable goals and/or culturally-desirable answers (Empey, 1956; Stephenson, 1957; Rodman, 1963). Keller and Zavalloni (1964) have argued that ambition, or high aspiration level, has been incorrectly defined solely in terms of desired educational or occupational goals. They contend that a lower status child aspiring to a college education has higher aspirations than a middle class child of college-educated parents. Like Miller, _et al_. (1965) cited earlier, they argue that aspirations ought to be measured in terms of the "distance" between the starting point of the individual and his aspired -for "destination" (e.g., the _relative_ goals discussed by Empey); furthermore, individual capacities and talents, as well as facilities (e.g., income) for achieving a goal, ought to be considered. With measures of this sort, differences among socio-economic levels would be lessened or perhaps reversed, the lower socio-economic displaying relatively higher levels of aspiration than the upper. They key issue in this argument is identifying individuals' points of origin. Sewell, _et al_. (1957) took into account both the abilities of individuals and their socio-economic status and found a positive relationship to aspiration, independent of intelligence.* Whatever the merits of the argument advanced by Keller and Zavalloni (1964), it still remains the case that children coming from different socio-economic levels have different educational and occupational intentions.

---

* Sewell's data also shows a critical sex difference in educational plans, college attendance, and college graduation. In general, for females, the relative effect of SES is greater than is the effect of intelligence; for

Turning now to work satisfaction experienced by adults, Blauner (1960), in an excellent review article covering a large number of empirical studies, finds that a majority of adults are satisfied with their jobs,* but that those in higher status jobs are more satisfied than those in lower status jobs. Blauner states that job satisfaction is directly related to the degree of control over the job's activities exercised by incumbents, and is higher in jobs where men work as teams and in jobs where men may form occupational communities (e.g., typographers and printers, or miners). Inkeles (1960), in a cross-national review of job satisfaction found that "The evidence is powerful and unmistakable that satisfaction with one's job is differentially experienced by those in the several standard occupational positions. From country to country, we observe a clear positive correlation between the over-all status of occupations and the experience of satisfaction in them" (p. 12).

Although impressionistic evidence is considerable that high status persons regard work as important to them and their occupations as more central to their self-definitions, little in the way of systematic study exists on this score. Morse and Weiss (1955) described differences between middle class men, who gain a sense of accomplishment and purpose from working, and working class men, for whom work was something to keep them busy.** Gurin, _et al_. (1960) found

---

males, the relative effect of intelligence is greater than that of SES. (The results of the original study are in Little (1958); some findings from the follow-up study are presented in Sewell and Shah (1967).)

* According to Robinson, _et al_. (1966), over 400 studies have reported percentages of workers dissatisfied with their jobs in the past thirty years; the median dissatisfaction rate over these studies is thirteen per cent.

** In this study, respondents were to assume that they were independently wealthy; therefore, they did not have to work for monetary return.

argument advanced by Keller and Zavalloni (1964), it still remains the case that children coming from different socio-economic levels have different educational and occupational intentions.

Turning now to work satisfaction experienced by adults, Blauner (1960), in an excellent review article covering a large number of empirical studies, finds that a majority of adults are satisfied with their jobs,* but that those in higher status jobs are more satisfied than those in lower status jobs. Blauner states that job satisfaction is directly related to the degree of control over the job's activities exercised by incumbents, and is higher in jobs where men work as teams and in jobs where men may form occupational communities (e.g., typographers and printers, or miners). Inkeles (1960), in a cross-national review of job satisfaction found that "The evidence is powerful and unmistakable that satisfaction with one's job is differentially experienced by those in the several standard occupational positions. From country to country, we observe a clear positive correlation between the over-all status of occupations and the experience of satisfaction in them" (p. 12).

Although impressionistic evidence is considerable that high status persons regard work as important to them and their occupations as more central to their self-definitions, little in the way of systematic study exists on this score. Morse and Weiss (1955) described differences between middle class men, who gain a sense of accomplishment and purpose from working, and working class men, for whom work was something to keep them busy.** Gurin, et al. (1960) found

---

males, the relative effect of intelligence is greater than that of SES. (The results of the original study are in Little (1958); some findings from the follow-up study are presented in Sewell and Shah (1967).)

* According to Robinson, et al. (1966), over 400 studies have reported percentages of workers dissatisfied with their jobs in the past thirty years; the median dissatisfaction rate over these studies is thirteen per cent.

** In this study, respondents were to assume that they were independently wealthy; therefore, they did not have to work for monetary return.

that feelings of inadequacy among employed men were linked to job dissatisfaction. There was a higher degree of satisfaction among those who saw their jobs as intrinsically interesting than among those who saw their jobs as mainly providing material rewards and extrinsic status. Their findings showed that higher educational levels and job status led to more ego-involvement and greater satisfaction on the one hand, but also to more work problems on the other. Similarly, Lyman (1955) reports that white-collar workers give greater emphasis to the character of the work itself and to freedom, while blue-collar workers emphasize rewards and the conditions of work.

At the beginning of this sub-section, we suggested that work satisfaction is one of the rewards of occupational position and available research sustains that position. Although, it may be the case thay types of work satisfaction differ for different occupational groups and positions.* Clearly, any assessment of these studies should bear in mind that they do not consider work in relation to, or interaction with, other aspects of life and how these interrelationships may vary by social class.**

Leisure-time Activities:

Although studies of uses of leisure are part of the literature on SES correlates, it is difficult properly to place these studies in a systematic scheme. On the one hand, leisure is looked upon as the use of non-work time, and is closely related to the topic of work satisfaction,* occupational aspirations, and the like. On the other hand, leisure time activities can also be viewed as expressions of value preferences and hence related to the research on differential values of social class levels. In any event, it is clear that the uses of leisure time constitute an important research topic. Indeed, if as some commentators suggest, the amount of leisure time available to the American population is increasing,** the interest of social scientists in this area of behavior will also increase.

---

* Note that we did not discuss the concept of work alienation and its possible sources. For discussion of the concept and reports of studies see Wilensky (1964b) and Blauner (1964).

** Some of these interrelationships are discussed in Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965), Chapter 2. In this work, work satisfaction is an independent, rather than a dependent variable; the focus of the study being on the effects of current environmental forces on psychological well-being. Also see the study by Wilensky and Ladinsky (1967).

Although a considerable literature exists in this area, much of the empirical work deals with small homogeneous subgroups of the population, or, more usually with a limited aspect of leisure time use. Extensive research exists on the utilization of television (Glick and Levy, 1962; Steiner, 1963), outdoor recreation (Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Study Report #20, 1965), adult educational programs (Johnstone and Rivera, 1965), to mention only a few. Studies of adolescents have typically included mention of leisure time activities (e.g., Coleman, 1961; Havighurst, _et al._, 1962).

A few scattered studies exist which attempt to document the use of leisure, by social class, without emphasis on a given aspect. In a study of families (N=673 families containing 1741 persons over six) in Ohio, White (1955) finds that the use of parks and playgrounds, attendance at church services and, with slight variations, rates for community-chest services, museums and ethnic-racial organizations are inversely associated with social class (using Warner's ISC classification). The use of libraries, home activities and lecture-study courses is positively associated with social class. Clarke's (1956) study of 574 white males in Columbus, Ohio, reports similar findings. Clarke, however, divided his respondents into five occupational prestige levels, using the North-Hatt scale.

---

* See publications and research reports from "Work, Careers, and Leisure Styles: A Study of Sources of Societal Integration," a program of research directed by H.L.Wilensky (Wilensky, 1961, 1964); also Anderson (1961), DeGrazia (1962), and the volume edited by Larrabee and Meyersohn (1958). The last mentioned publication contains an extensive bibliography.

** Two trends call this assumption into question: first, there seems to be a slow-down in the tendency toward shorter industrial hours (Zeisel, 1956); second, the increasing entry of women into the labor force and the increase of multiple job-holding.

He finds that the lowest prestige group is more likely to watch television, play with children, fish, play card games (excluding bridge), take drives, go to drive-ins, spend time in taverns and at ball games. The highest prestige group reports cultural activities (theatre, concerts, art galleries), reading, studying, home entertainment, attendance at conventions and community service work.

A study conducted by the Survey Research Center for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC Study Report, #20, 1962) reports leisure time activities and their relationships to various socio-economic characteristics. It is worth noting that the results clearly show that upper income people and those with more formal education make more active use of their leisure time than others. According to individuals' own reports, they use leisure for activities and hobbies rather than relaxing and resting, and the number of activities seems to rise with both education and income. Only if we interpret income and education as reflecting, to some extent, social class differences in life style and interest patterns do these results become meaningful. Thus, some forms of recreation which involve minimal expense, or none at all, rise with income, and those likely to involve more expense and equipment are not always income related.

Perhaps reflecting a societal view that leisure is a reward for hard work, the leisure and recreational patterns of the underemployed and the unemployed of the past few decades are almost unknown. Clearly, the need for extensive research into both the budgeting of time in general, and forms of leisure of various groups is evident.*

C. Personality and Personal Adjustment:

Although the literature on the "lower-lowers" does not ordinarily make direct references to personality and personal adjustment, the relevance of this topic seems clear. Side stepping, for a moment, the difficult problem of the lack of precise meanings of these terms,** it is pertinent to inquire whether there are class differences in personality. The implications of such differences are important in resolving the disagreement over whether the poor are happy or not, and whether the "lower-lowers" are so badly impaired that the majority cannot escape from their condition for this reason.

---

* One of the major research projects, currently underway, which will begin to fill in the gaps in our knowledge of time utilization is the Multinational Comparative Time Budget Research Project, directed by Alexander Szalai, Principal Scientific Research Officer of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) in New York. Szalai (1966) has written a description of the project and presented some preliminary findings. The final results will be published this year. The American contribution to the study was directed by Philip Converse, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, and is based on a sample of 1244 individuals. Extensive analyses of the American data will be published by the Survey Research Center.

** See Jahoda (1958) for a review of the ambiguity of the term "mental health." This ambiguity is shared by other terms involving the assessment of adequacy of functioning. Although the term "mental health" seems almost incapable of being given specific content, the term "physical illness" is not exempt from difficulties either. The problem is similar to that of defining the dividing line between those who are poor and those who are not. There is consensus over extremes, e.g., persons without income and persons in catatonic trances are respectively poor and mentally ill; however, the borders of poverty and mental illness are in dispute. When terms are stated positively, as in the case of mental health and physical health, it is often not merely the absence of negative symptoms that is meant, but some positive features as well, over which more disagreement can ordinarily arise.

Although Brim, _et al_. (1965) estimate that a majority of American adults have taken personality, and/or aptitude tests (usually in connection with application for school or for a job), there is remarkably little published literature based on extensive and well-selected samples which contrasts different class levels on attitudinal or personality characteristics.

In 1952, Auld critically reviewed over thirty studies concerned with the relationship of social status to personality. He found very few studies which were based on adequate samples. Most of the studies report social class differences, but in only one-third of the studies are they appreciable. Where such differences were found, upper-status (middle class) respondents tended to score higher in personal adjustment than lower status (working class) subjects.

In a later review article, Sewell (1961) evaluated findings concerning social class and childhood personality. He found that there is a relatively low correlation between the position of a child in a social stratification system and some aspects of his personality, including measured personality adjustment. Empirical evidence does not support the view that neurotic personality traits are more prevalent among middle class children, but suggests that these traits may be more characteristic of the lower class child. Like Auld (1952), Sewell criticized reviewed research as defective from a theoretical as well as a methodological standpoint.

Rosenberg's (1965) study of feelings of self-esteem found that adolescents (5,000 high-school juniors and seniors) from higher social classes are somewhat more likely to accept themselves than those from the lower social strata.

The differences are not large (51 per cent of the highest class scored high, as compared to 35 per cent of the lowest group). However, greater differences in self-esteem appear when religious and ethnic groups are considered.

Numerous other studies report similar and somewhat equivocal findings, although their coverage is less extensive. For example, Mensh, et al. (1959) report that rural and small town children from high SES families show fewer indications of personality maladjustment than do children from lower status families. A similar finding was provided by Sewell and Haller (1956), who report small correlations of .159 between the child's personality adjustment score and the prestige status of the child's family in the community. In sum, the evidence points to a weak relationship between socio-economic status and measures of personality, while other characteristics play as strong, or stronger, roles.

The best evidence on the relationships between socio-economic status and emotional problems comes from more extensive sample surveys of adult populations. A national sample study conducted by the Survey Research Center (Gurin, et. al., 1960) asked respondents whether they had ever experienced simple symptoms of mental or emotional upset, sufficient to warrant seeking some sort of help. Nearly a fourth of the national sample (N=2,640) indicated having distress serious enough to warrant seeking some help, with the proportions rising inversely with socio-economic status. Gurin, et al., (1960) found that better educated respondents were more introspective, but had a greater sense of well-being and satisfaction with the self. Thus, "high income is associated with greater happiness, fewer worries, more frequent anticipation of future happiness, fewer physical symptoms, and more symptoms of energy immobilization. Low income implies current unhappiness and worries, a lack of confidence in the future, and the expression of anxiety through physical symptoms (page 218)."

In a less extensive study, Bradburn (1967) found that lower status respondents reported higher levels of negative feelings and lower levels of positive feelings. Indeed, it is the Negro residents of inner-city Detroit who report the lowest amount of positive feelings and the greatest unhappiness. The study also shows that "lower class people tend to repress anger and perhaps feelings in general. Displays of temper, indignation, and anger, the emotional responses to real or supposed wrongs, may well be emotions permitted only to the more well-to-do (Caplovitz and Bradburn, 1964)."

It should be noted that in both the Survey Research Center study (Gurin, et al., 1960) and the Bradburn, et al., studies (Bradburn, 1967; Caplovitz and Bradburn, 1964), socio-economic status was not the highest correlate of emotional distress. More important than social status differences are differences by age and life cycle, the elderly tending to show greater signs of emotional distress than any other group.

Both Gurin, et al. (1960) and Bradburn (1967) rely on a sample survey approach using interviewers who are neither professional nor quasi-professionals in the field of mental health. In contrast, the Midtown studies (Srole, et al., 1962 and Langner and Michael, 1963) are more intensive and place greater emphasis on interviews and evaluations by mental health professionals. The studies are based on intensive interviews with a representative sample of more than 1,600 persons living in the Midtown area of Manhattan. The protocols of the interviews were reviewed by psychiatrists and rated as falling in one of six graded steps of mental health. In addition, private and public mental hospitals in the New York area, out-patient clinics, and private practitioners were contacted for information on any patient who was a Midtown resident. The findings indicate an association between Impairment (the last three mental health categories mentioned above) and parental socio-economic status levels. The progression is approximately linear, from 17.5% impaired in the highest group, to 32.7% in the lowest. However, in the discussion of individuals in treatment, no such progression is noted.

The same pattern of relationships is also found in studies of hospitalization for psychiatric disorders. The classic study of ecological distribution of mental hospital patients in Chicago by Faris and Dunham (1939) found that schizophrenic patients were more likely to come from the poorer sections of the city; areas characterized by high mobility had especially high rates of prevalence of schizophrenia. However, the ecological distributions of manic-depression and senile psychoses are not related to the socio-economic status of areas.

More recently, Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) reported the class distribution of almost 2,000 psychiatric patients being treated in public and private hospitals, clinics, and by private psychiatrists in New Haven. They find a relatively strong inverse relationship to socio-economic status, with the lowest status group manifesting more than three times the prevalence rates of the highest status group.* When the total rates are decomposed, it is evident that psychoses are inversely related to social class, while neuroses are positively related to social class.

The New Haven and Midtown findings are consistent with a number of earlier studies; e.g., Clark (1949) reported a correlation of -0.75 between male first admission rates of patients to psychiatric hospitals and occupational status.** In a study of hospitalized Negro schizophrenics, Kleiner, et al. (1960) found inverse relationships, but the data also show a slight decrease of rates for the lowest group. In contrast, Jaco's (1960) study of admissions to Texas public and private psychiatric hospitals reports the highest rates for both unemployed and professional groups.

---

* The prevalence rates, adjusted for age and sex, indicate a sharp decrease between the lowest status group and the other four classes; this suggests that the lowest group in New Haven has qualitatively greater prevalence of mental illness.

** Clark has computed age-adjusted occupation-specific psychoses rates for

Attempts to measure the amount of mental illness in non-hospitalized populations lead only to additional confusion. Studies conducted in small communities either show a slight inverse relationship for schizophrenia (Frumkin, 1954) or no relationship at all (Clausen and Kohn, 1959). As a possible explanation for the findings observed in Hagerstown, Maryland, Clausen and Kohn (1959) suggest that selective outmigration of lower-class schizophrenics may account for their failure to confirm other findings. In a comparison of hospitalized and non-hospitalized cases of psychoses in Wellesley, Massachusetts, Kaplan, et al. (1956) report that the incidence of non-hospitalized psychoses was higher in the upper as compared to lower status groups; although, when added to hospitalized cases, the total prevalence was greater in the lower class. However, Pasamanick, et al. (1959) find an inverse relationship between psychoses and social class in non-hospitalized populations; the lowest class in the study shows the lowest incidence. They attribute this finding to the high proportion of Negroes in the lowest group.

To further confound the attempt to establish regularities, there is some evidence that mental health professionals react differently to persons on different levels. Haase (1964) found that when identical Rorschach psychograms, but with varying social class background histories, were presented to

---

each of nineteen occupational groups, ranked these in order of increasing psychoses rates and correlated them with the ranking of occupations in terms of increasing income and prestige. This method leads to higher correlation than if the correlation had been computed over individuals, i.e., it is an ecological correlation.

psychologists for evaluation, the same Rorschach tended to be evaluated as more frequently having been produced by a psychotic when low status identifications were attached. Rosengren (1962) reports in an analysis of case materials of ex-psychiatric patients (matched by the original diagnosis of illness, age, and sex) that "these materials suggested a perspective [on the part of mental health personnel] toward the lower class child which might be summed as _blame-control_, and a frame of reference for the middle class child which might be summed up as _explain-treat_ (p. 18)." Similarly, Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) found that psychiatrists preferred to deal with upper status patients and would more often prescribe intensive psychotherapy to such patients.

More recently, a study of 610 children seen in the Children's Psychiatric Hospital of the University of Michigan's Medical Center during 1960-61 (Harrison, _et al._, 1965) reports a positive correlation between recommendations for psychotherapeutic treatment and the families' higher socio-economic status. The authors note that what is significant about this correlation is not in terms of the mental health problems of the children but in terms of the greater affinity with higher status groups on the part of psychotherapists. In another report from the same study (McDermott, _et al._, 1965), a comparison is made of the historic and psychiatric data on a sub-group of 263 children of 'blue collar' families, dividing them into two groups on the basis of their fathers' occupations, i.e., skilled and unskilled. They report that "The 'unskilled' group was seen as having a significantly higher incidence of diagnosed personality and borderline states...Although...home adjustment ratings were comparable within the two groups, the 'unskilled' group was seen as presenting a significantly greater problem in school. Referrals for professional treatment nonetheless were found to be made relatively later for the 'unskilled.'"*

To some degree, lower status persons show characteristics which tend to complement the treatment they receive from mental-health personnel. Star (1955,1956) shows that lower status individuals are less likely to recognize signs of mental disorder when presented with vignettes describing persons manifesting behavior problems.** A number of subsequent surveys*** have also confirmed the findings that the higher the educational and occupational level of a respondent "the more optimistic he was about the likelihood of recovery from mental illness, the greater the tendency to recommend professional treatment, the more frequently he qualified his response about the possibility of hereditary factors being involved in mental illness...and the less frequently he cited poor living conditions as a cause of mental disease (Halpert, 1965)." Gurin, _et al_. (1960) also found that education was positively related to whether or not a respondent would seek professional help for an emotional problem, while Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) found that low-status patients were puzzled by psychotherapy and unable to grasp the fact that "talking" was the treatment.

---

* For specific criticisms of the mental health professions, see Schneiderman (1965), Riessman and Scribner (1965), and Riessman, _et al_. (1964).

** A recent study in Baltimore by Lemkau and Crocetti (1962) shows considerable changes in the public's ability to correctly identify these vignettes as indicating mental disorder. Whereas in the NORC (Star, 1955) study, only 34% identified simple schizophrenia, in this work 78% were able to do so. However, the authors do not indicate whether the lower socio-economic group is participating in this general shift towards a more psychogenic interpretation of behavior disorders.

*** Freeman and Kassebaum, 1960; Lemkau and Crocetti, 1962; and Meyer, 1964.

The studies cited in this section display heterogeneity in design and coverage; to some unknown degree, this heterogeneity may account for the seeming contradictions manifested in their results. Since the study of both the epidemiology and etiology of personality disorder has been the concern of scholars from varied fields, we are certain that our coverage is limited. We have not, furthermore, discussed the differential care received by low SES individuals within treatment institutions, social class factors related to length of mental hospital stay,* rehospitalization rates for mental illness by social class, nor the acceptance of mental patients by their families and social groups upon discharge.**

H. Intellectual Performance and Linguistic Behavior:

Since the analysis of the relationship between Army Alpha Examination scores and the occupations of World War I draftees,*** few empirical findings have seemed better established than those relating SES and performance on tests of intellectual functioning. Specific studies are too numerous to review, but there is a fair amount of consensus among the studies that the magnitude of the correlation ranges from .40-.50 (Friedhoff, 1955; Anastasi, 1958; Knief and Stroud, 1959; Wolf, 1965). Similar findings have been documented for the relationship between SES and academic performance as measured by rank in class, grade-point averages, and achievement test scores.**** Parental SES tends to correlate between .30-.60 with measures of performance in school, depending on subject matter (Rossi, et. al., 1959).

---

* See, for example, the review by Krause (1967).

** A discussion of attitudes toward deviant behavior, by social class, with emphasis on the issue of mental health is presented by Dohrenwend and Chin-Shong (1967).

*** See the discussion by Miner (1957), pp. 67-71.

**** A useful summary of the major findings from studies of education and social class is given in Herriott and St. John (1966), Chapter I.

Of special interest to this review are researches on differences between Negroes and whites in both I.Q. tests and school performance. Coleman, et al. (1966) find consistent differences in achievement between Negroes and whites, holding a number of background factors constant. Furthermore, they find that the background factors account for more of the variance in achievement at earlier grades than at later ones, the decline, however, being slight. In a report from the Institute for Developmental Studies in New York, Deutsch and Brown (1964) find that at each SES level, Negro children score lower on I.Q. tests than whites and that Negro-white differences increase at each higher SES level. Recently, Hicks and Pellegrini (1966) evaluated twenty-seven studies of differences in Negro vs. white I.Q. and concluded that knowledge of race accounts for only 6% of the variance in I.Q.*

In the early 1920's, these relationships were first documented on a large scale. They sparked a nature-nurture controversy which diminished only when it became obvious that there was no powerful methodology available to settle the question, nor to partition among heredity or environment their proper shares of the total variance in I.Q. or intellectual performance. Currently, it is generally accepted that some portion of individuals' performance on such tasks is accounted for by genetic** differences and some portion is accounted for by differences in life experiences and other environmental factors, although the exact proportion may never be fully worked out.*

---

* Dreger and Miller (1960) present a review of published psychological studies, 1943-1958, which involve Negro-white comparisons. They note that although Negroes score lower on tests of intellectual functions, they average well within the normal range for whites.

** Note that "genetic" does not imply direct and simple inheritance of traits, but that there are genetic differences in the gene pools of each parent. Thus, the correlation between scores on the National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test is .9 for identical twins, and .6 for fraternal twins; the latter is

Since linguistic behavior is directly implicated in measures of intellectual performance, studies of the learning and use of language by people of different socio-economic levels lead to further specifications of the relationship between SES and intellectual performance. Consequently, special note should be taken of studies which do investigate the processes which link socio-economic status and linguistic behavior.

Schatzman and Strauss (1955), studying the protocols of interviews with survivors of natural disasters, noted qualitative differences in the way in which persons of different class levels described their experiences. Upper status respondents tended to be concrete in their descriptions, able to see the disaster from the position of others, and tended to use specific names rather than general pronouns; the language of the lower status respondents had the opposite characteristics.

Following along the same lines, Bernstein (1958, 1960, 1962, 1964a) provides a more elaborate characterization of class differences in the use of language: he distinguishes between class-differentiated modes of cognition and modes in which the expression of language modifies perception. He postulates (Bernstein, 1958) the existence of "public" and "formal" languages (or, in his later work, "restricted" and "elaborated" codes). "Public" language consists of short, grammmatically simple, often unfinished sentences in poor syntax with an emphasis on emotive rather than logical implications. "Formal" language is rich in personal, individual, qualifications (e.g., "I believe

---

not too different from the correlation between parents and their children (Nichols, 1967).

* For a current discussion of the relationship between genetics and social processes, with special references to the study of intelligence, see Eckland (1967).

that...") and its form implies stress on logical relationships among concepts, with tone and volume taking second place to logical meaning. He argues not only that these codes can be distinguished, but that their use is class-correlated and independent of measured intelligence. In particular, the middle-class child is socialized to use both codes, whereas the working class child is restricted to the "public" language.*

Hess and co-workers (Hess and Shipman, 1965, 1966a, 1966b; Bear, et al., 1965; Olim, et al., 1967) have extended the empirical base of Bernstein's insights and provided knowledge concerning the genesis of class differences in the use of language. Their study was designed to test the existence of a relationship between the child's cognitive development and the mother's verbal ability, maternal teaching style, and characteristic mode of family control. In an early report from this study of 160 Negro mothers and their pre-school children drawn from four socio-economic levels, Hess and Shipman (1965) conclude that "...the meaning of deprivation is a deprivation of meaning -- a cognitive environment in which behavior is controlled by status rules rather than by attention to the individual characteristics of the situation, and one in which behavior is not mediated by verbal cues or by teaching that relates events to one another and the present to the future."

In short, lower status mothers tell their children what to do without explaining why it should be done.**

Not only does class-linked linguistic behavior help us to understand the functioning of different social class levels in the performance of intellectual tasks, but such differences can also serve as indicators of class position (as G.B. Shaw saw so well in Pygmalion.). In one study, Harms (1961) played to a sample of respondents (N=180) content-neutral recordings made by speakers from three status groups. He found that respondents were able to identify correctly the social status of the speakers, with a slight tendency to be able to identify members from one's own status group more accurately; listeners also attributed higher ratings of "credibility" to higher status speakers, regardless of their own social status. Furthermore, there is a positive correlation between the subjective class evaluation of a speaker and the credibility attributed to him (the average correlation over the nine cells is .50). A number of research findings also support the contention that neither racial nor regional dialects of speakers inhibit the ability of listeners to identify the speakers' social class (Putnam and O'Hern, 1955; Harms, 1963; Ellis, 1963). Another implication present in these studies is that education does not completely erase auditory cues which make class distinctions possible. For example, in one series of experiments, Ellis (1967) used college students as speakers. Yet, listeners were able to identify the status of family background.*

---

* Bernstein's own experiments have been restricted to analyzing the verbal behavior of a group of 16-year-old boys; however, a later article (Bernstein, 1964b) applies the framework to cover the therapist-patient relationship.

** A recent review (Cazden, 1966) nicely summarizes the state of knowledge

Labov (1964) has analyzed the linguistic structure of adult subjects in the New York metropolitan area, and found that linguistic variables correlate with objective indicators of social-status position. For example, an analysis of the phoneme _th_ shows that upper-middle-class respondents depart very little, in all types of linguistic contexts,** from the prestige standard of radio

---

concerning "subcultural" differences in the language of children.

* The listeners produced mean ratings of the speakers' social status which correlated .80 with Hollingshead's measure.

** The linguistic interviews obtained samples of careful speech, casual speech, reading style, and pronunciation of specific word lists.

and TV announcers; however, the lower the class, the more pronounced the differences between different syles, as well as the distance from the most prestigious style.

It should be borne in mind that although the relationships between socio-economic status and I.Q. are well documented, studies of linguistic processes have yet to move out of the state of small projects accomplished with, at best, haphazard and casual samples. Hess' (1965) study, which can be regarded as the most systematic yet to appear in the literature, is based upon observations on Negroes in one neighborhood of Chicago and has not been replicated in ohter regions of the country, with other types of groups. We have also been unable to locate any studies which investigate the consequences of speech behavior as an indicator of social status: if an individual's speech reveals his social status, is this a handicap to lower status individuals, e.g., in the job interview situation?

Omitted from this review is any discussion of the quality of education available to lower status groups and possible effects thereof on performance. Linguistic development is one of the prior variables in understanding the relationships between SES and intellectual performance. The "quality" of educational experiences, however, become a possible major intervening variable between individuals and their performance. The most extensive study along these lines (Coleman, et al., 1966) indicates that most measures of educational quality are only marginally related to performance on intellectual tasks, once socio-economic status is held constant. Other studies* of adults, however, hold forth the possibility that some educational quality effects may yet be found.

---

* Some of these relationships are discussed in the report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1967). Unpublished data analyzed by NORC from its study for the Commission indicates that, controlling for parental education, verbal achievement, and school quality are positively correlated. For a discussion of facilities available to different groups in one city, see Sexton (1961); the impact of pupil background on teachers has been studied by

I. Values and Ideology:

As a concept in sociology, "values" has a particularly murky position. Indeed, it would have been possible, following at least one definition of "value," to write our preceding sub-sections entirely in terms of socio-economic differentials in values. Thus, the discussion of child-rearing practices could have been stated in terms of the differences in desired behavioral tendencies sought by middle class and lower class parents. In order to bypass the difficult question of whether a particular practice or behavioral tendency actually expressed generalized preferences or desired end states, we have preferred to review the literature primarily in terms of behavior and predisposition, leaving to this sub-section studies involving highly generalized preferences, views of the world, and the society. For convenience, we have separated values from ideology, the latter being primarily related to evaluations of society and its component parts.

Despite the emphasis on values by writers who subscribe to the view that the "lower-lowers" constitute a subculture, there have been few studies of values seen as generalized world views. Using Kluckhohn's (Kluckhohn, 1950, 1951; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961) multi-dimensional classification of value systems, Schneiderman (1964) administered questionnaires to a small sample of 35 relief clients in St. Paul, Minnesota, a sample of 68 social workers employed by the Department of Public Welfare, and a sample of 52

Herriott and St. John (1966); the possible differential treatments meted out to low income students and possible solutions are discussed by Riessman (1962).

teachers of the children from the 35 families. Schneiderman found that responses from the teachers and the social workers were in such strong agreement that they could be considered as drawn from the same population. The welfare clients professed value patterns markedly different from the professionals' -- a world view which sees man as subjugated to, or in harmony with, nature as opposed to a view which sees man as mastering nature; a present-time orientation as opposed to a future-time orientation; an individualistic orientation as opposed to a lineal or collateral one (showing in this respect little difference from professional social workers or teachers); a slight, although not significant, preference for a pessimistic as opposed to an optimistic view of human nature; and an orientation to being rather than becoming.

A more elaborate study was reported in an article by Cohen and Hodges (1963) based upon interviews with 2600 male heads of households in three counties in the San Francisco area. The article presents in a summary form generalizations contrasting the "lower blue collar" respondents with others interviewed.* They characterize this group as having a simplified experiential contact with the world (that is, a constriction of life experiences), a sense of deprivation with accompanying feelings of insecurity, and a consequent inability to cope with the problems of life. Lower blue-collar respondents are further characterized as anti-intellectual and authoritarian, with corresponding intolerance for violators of conventional morality and for minority groups a pessimism concerning the future, and a misanthropic view of mankind.

---

* Unfortunately, their presentation does not contain a clear statement of either how they distinguish this group from others nor detailed descriptions of the questionnaires used. This appears to be a preliminary report of the research, but we were unable to find a more detailed account of this particular study.

A similar characterization of working class life has been offered by S.M. Miller and Riessman (1961b) in which they identify the following themes: a concern for stability and security, traditionalism in moral precepts, anti-intellectualism, and appreciation of "excitement" among younger groups, and intensity concerning those things which matter to them. Miller and Riessman make a distinction between the "stable" working class described, and a "lower class" worker, the difference being that "lower class style is considered to be the inability to develop an adequate measure of coping with the environment so that some degree of security and stability ensues (p. 96)."

W. Miller (1958), in an article summarizing some results of his study of twenty-one street corner groups in Boston, presented a list of "focal concerns" of lower class culture which foster delinquent behavior. A considerable similarity between these concerns and the previous studies described in this section can be seen from the following list: toughness (masculinity), trouble (contacts with the police or other law enforcement agencies), smartness (getting by with a minimum of exertion and a maximum of mental agility), excitement (being where the action is), and autonomy (avoidance or rejection of external controls imposed by society).

The sense of powerlessness, inability to control one's fate, and detachment from the larger society is shown in a number of special studies directed at these dimensions. Cited earlier was the finding by Campbell, et al. (1960) that members of the working and lower class lack a feeling of political efficacy. A number of studies confirm that anomia* is more prevalent in the lower levels of the socio-economic ladder (Bell, 1957; Meier and Bell, 1959; Simpson and Miller, 1963).

---

* In these studies, anomia is usually measured with a scale constructed by Leo Srole. It attempts to measure the extent to which an individual feels that community leaders are indifferent to his needs, that he can do little to direct his life with any degree of time perspective, feelings of retrogression

The extent to which the lower class differs markedly in these respects from other groups in the society is hard to judge from any of these studies. Schneiderman's small scale study is perhaps the easiest to evaluate, but its scope is so narrow that confidence in its conclusions cannot be strongly justified. The conclusions of the study by Cohen and Hodges would be considerably strengthened had the authors presented more of their data. Whether descriptions presented by S.M. Miller and Riessman are correct or not is even harder to judge since whatever data may underlay their statements it is not documented in their presentations. Finally, the complete analysis of Walter Miller's study of a lower class area in Boston has not been published; it is therefore difficult to judge the extent to which the "focal concerns" isolated from the study of gangs can be extended to toher age and sex groupings.

Somewhat better studies exist of ideology; a fairly large number of studies indicate an inverse relationship between SES and expressed prejudice or social distance from minority groups. Stember (1966), in an analysis of the relationship of education to anti-semitism, shows that inverse relationships persist in a large number of national surveys conducted in the post World War II period. Utilizing data from a representative sample of adults (N=1182), Hodge and Treiman (1966) show an inverse relationship between SES and prejudice toward Negroes; this relationship is seen to hold whether SES is measured by income, education, or occupation (Treiman, 1966). A number of studies have used a Social Distance Scale in the study of prejudice toward

---

from goals already reached, loss of meaning of internalized group norms, values and goals, and lack of confidence in immediate personal relationships.

ethnic groups and found greater intergroup prejudice among lower SES levels (Westie, 1952; Westie and Howard, 1954; Westie and Westie, 1957).

In a study of tolerance for political deviants, Stouffer (1955) found that lower socio-economic groups were less tolerant toward socialists, communists, and atheists, although education played a stronger role in the relationships than occupation or income. Lower SES groups were more willing to bar communists and socialists from a variety of positions, including employment in non-sensitive private industries, than middle class respondents.

Lipset (1959), in a major review article of many studies, argues that the family patterns, educational experiences, characteristic tensions and insecurities, plus the lack of sophistication of low status individuals, predisposes them "to favor extremist, intolerant, and transvaluational forms of political and religious behavior."* Lipsitz (1965) disputes Lipset's findings by showing that for three national sample surveys most of the inverse relationship between authoritarianism and SES can be eliminated by controlling for the educational attainment of respondents. S.M. Miller and Riessman (1961a) also dispute Lipset's findings, although mainly on the grounds that the measures of authoritarianism employed are biased in favor of the middle class.

---

* The original presentation of the relationship between authoritarianism and prejudice was conceived chiefly in connection with middle class support for fascist movements (Adorno, et al., 1950). Partly due to biased sampling, the finding that the lower middle class is the most prejudiced and authoritarian has not been sustained in subsequent findings. Janowitz and Marvick (1953), for example, find an inverse relationship between authoritarianism (using a short version of the F-scale) and SES. For some of the critiques of the original Adorno, et al., work, see Christie and Jahoda (1954); for a summary of the research findings of the many studies in this area, see Christie and Cook (1958).

The socio-economic differentials in voting behavior and political ideology have been well documented. In a review of the psychology of voting, Lipset, et al. (1954) note that in every economically developed country, the lower income groups vote mainly for parties of the left, while higher income groups vote for parties of the right. In the United States, a positive association between socio-economic status and voting for the Republican party is a sociological commonplace (Lipset, et al., 1954; Campbell, et al., 1960, 1966). Studies of political issues indicate that lower SES groups usually take the more liberal position on a variety of issues affecting support for labor unions, increased welfare activities of the state, and opposition to the power of business (Centers, 1949; Berelson, et al., 1954; Campbell, et al., 1960, 1966; Stouffer, 1955).* Similar findings for other Western countries are reported by Alford (1963).

A further question, and of particular importance in its policy implications, is that of the ideology of relief -- whether there exists a discrete set of attitudes about giving and receiving public welfare. The distinction between contributory social insurance and the "dole" has been at the heart of conventional wisdom about the American approach to poverty for the past half-century (Brown, 1956). The prevailing image of public opinion has the public reluctant about handing out the dole and the poor uncomfortable about receiving handouts.

Empirical evidence bearing on these assumptions is scant, indeed, and is spread across three decades. As a result attempts to synthesize even what is available are confounded by three historical phenomena: (1) only during the Thirties, and not since, it was possible for the public to fix the blame for poverty on a national economic catastrophe; (2) because the poor and the Negro have in recent years become so largely coterminous in the public mind, it is difficult to know when attitudes toward race confound to attitudes toward welfare; and (3) the Aid to Dependent Children has overshadowed Old Age Assistance as the dominant public assistance program in the last decade.

---

* As indicated earlier, working class liberalism does not extend toward civil liberties for deviant political groups; in those instances, the working class is more likely to take a conservative position. On an individual level, it appears that liberalism on economic issues is often correlated inversely with liberal views on civil rights for deviant groups.

Nevertheless, what evidence is available does not clearly support the stereotypes. In a compendium of national surveys on social security over the past thirty years, Schiltz (1968) notes a marked absence of concern for the allegedly superior aspects of old age insurance arising from its contributory and non-means-test provisions. Pinner, _et al_. (1959), in a study of OAA recipients in California, found a propensity for the aged to regard their checks as a matter of right. Pinner's indirect evidence supports that of Bond, _et al_. (1954) who found, in another California survey, that the children of needy aged, prefer their parents to go on relief, even if the children are capable of supporting their parents; and that the parents prefer public support to that of their children.*

Even more important, the evidence is abundant that the American public, both as taxpayers and as relief consumers, regard the poverty of the aged quite differently than poverty among younger age groups. Schiltz (1968) notes that from 1936-1946, old age programs received nearly unanimous support from all sectors of the population, while unemployment compensation received less support, and generated sharp cleavages along urban-rural and educational continua, the college-educated rural resident being the most hostile.

---

* Pinner also reports that more OAA recipients are "glad" to be on OAA than are "embarassed" by it.

The distinguishing feature seems to be that the aged cannot be expected to work, and thus deserve support (Pinner, 1959). Studies of depression unemployment (Bakke, 1940; Angell, 1936) seem to suggest that what demeans is not the acceptance of charity, but the implicit prior assumption that one has failed in not getting and holding a job. Survey evidence is overwhelming that Americans preferred work relief to cash relief during the depression, and there was no difference on this attitude by income class or relief status (Schiltz, 1968). Bakke (1940) notes the restored self-image among those on work relief. Pinner (1959) concludes that the work ethic is stronger among those who have had a marginally successful work history than among those who have not.

In this connection, the findings by Goodchilds and Smith (1963) are relevant. They found, among a small sample of unemployed men, that middle class respondents tended to lower their self-appraisal as the length of unemployment increased, while working class respondents' self-appraisal increased. The finding that unemployment apparently had more of a negative effect on middle class respondents is consistent with Bakke, the finding of increases in positive self-perceptions with the length of unemployment on the part of lower status respondents needs further clarification.

If there is evidence that the work ethic is salient, there is little evidence that economic self-interest is equally so. In an examination of scores of survey questions related to social security programs and welfare policy, Schiltz (1968) finds no consistent patterns among income or age lines.

Tangible evidence about the effect of relief on the incentive to work is hard to come by. Lane (1962), in his intensive interviewing of lower middle class Westport men, finds a deeply ingrained belief that the lower classes would stop working if their needs were met by a dole. Whether this belief pervades the public generally has never been tested.

Clearly widespread is the conviction that relief recipients cheat (Schiltz, 1968; Lane, 1962; Bond, 1954) -- a conviction which is not strongly influenced by income class; and the implication seems to be that cheating by relief recipients is more reprehensible than analogous white-collar deceptions (Lane, 1962). But this willingness to ascribe "chiselling" to the relief recipient is consistently accompanied by a willingness to sustain or increase present levels of relief. It may be that the American public is caught in a cross-pressure between its philanthropic impulse and its competitive-work ethic. This attitude is caught directly in Lane (1962) and summarized in Schiltz (1968). At the same time, cheating appears to be different from the perspective of the recipient. Bakke (1940) describes the delicate style, developed from experience, necessary to "con" the relief worker into a few extras, and suggests that the art of getting the most out of the "system" became, for many depression men, an acceptable status substitute for the art of getting and keeping a job.

Finally, the American public has been rather consistently unwilling to firmly fix responsibility for individual poverty. Schiltz (1968) has shown that although more willing to ascribe poverty to "circumstances" during the depression, Americans in the Sixties are about equally divided as to whether a person's poverty is his own fault, that of circumstances alone, or both taken together.

An Overview:

The images of the poor are largely substantiated in the literature on the correlates of social class position. But, the crucial finding of our review of this body of research is that the characteristics of the poor are at best exaggerated forms of conditions which beset the lower range of socio-economic status in general. If the poor show more marital discord and more personality disorder than the affluent, so also do the remainder of the blue-collar contingent in our society. In other words, there is little substantiation for the view that the poor are marked off from the rest of society in a qualitatively distinctive way.

It can also be said that the controversy over whether the poor are happy or unhappy can be settled from our review of the literature. A variety of studies indicate that being on the bottom of the stratification system raises your probabilities of being unhappy. While this evidence does not (and can never) answer the question of whether the poor and the affluent are reporting the same phenomenon in terms of "true" happiness, the burden of providing proof for the happiness of the poor shifts onto those who hold that position.

The definitive studies of the characteristics of the very poor, have yet to appear in the literature. Some may very well be underway at this writing, and others may be undertaken within the next few years. It is abundantly clear that such studies are needed. We cannot base our social policies on either mythical conceptions of this group, or on case studies of unknown reliability and generality, or on the existing fragments in the literature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, T.W.; Frenkel-Brunswik, Else; Levinson, Daniel J.; and Sanford, R. Nevitt. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper & Bros., 1950.

Akers, Ronald. Socio-economic status and delinquent behavior: A re-test. J. res. crime Delinq., 1964, 1, No. 1 (January), 38-46.

Alexander, C. Norman, Jr., and Campbell, Ernest Q. Peer influence on adolescent educational aspirations and attainment. ASR, 1964, 29, No. 4 (August), 568-575.

Alford, Robert R. Party and society: the Anglo-American democracies. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Alinsky, Saul. Reveille for radicals. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.

Anastasi, A. Differential psychology. New York: Macmillan, 1958.

Anderson, Nels. Work and leisure. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Anderson, Odin W. Infant mortality and social and cultural factors. In E. Gartley Jaco (ed.), Patients, physicians and illness. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1958. Pp. 10-24.

Anderson, W.H. Locke. Trickling down: The relationship between economic growth and the extent of poverty among American families. Quarterly J. of Economics, 1964, 78. (November), 511-524.

Angell, Robert Cooley. The family encounters the depression. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Antonovsky, Aaron. Social class and illness: A reconsideration. Sociological Inquiry, 1967, 37, No. 2 (Spring), 311-322.

Antonovsky, Aaron, and Lerner, Melvin J. Occupational aspirations of lower class Negro and white youth. Soc. Prob., 1959, 7, No. 2 (Fall).

Antonovsky, Aaron, and Lorwin, Lewis L. (eds.). Discrimination and low incomes. New York: New School for Social Research, 1959.

Atkinson, John W., and Feather, Norman T. (eds.). A theory of achievement motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Auld, Frank, Jr. Influences of social class on personality test responses. Psychol. Bull., 1952, 49, No. 4, Part 1 (July), 318-332.

Bakke, E. Wright. Citizens without work: A study of the effects of unemployment upon the worker's social relations and practices. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.

Bates, William. Social stratification and juvenile delinquency. Amer. Cath. sociol. Rev., 1960, 21, No. 3 (Fall), 221-228.

____________. Caste, class and vandalism. Soc. Prob., 1962, 9, No. 4 (Spring), 348-353.

Bear, Roberta Meyer; Hess, Robert D.; and Shipman, Virginia C. Social class differences in maternal attitudes toward school and the consequences for cognitive development in the young child. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, February 19, 1965, Chicago, Illinois.

Beilin, Harry. The pattern of postponability and its relation to social class and mobility. J. soc. Psychol., 1956, 44, 33-48.

Bell, Gerald D. Processes in the formation of adolescents' aspirations. SF, 1963, 42, No. 2 (December), 179-186.

Bell, Robert R. Lower class Negro mothers' aspirations for their children. SF, 1965, 43 (May), 493-500.

Bell, Wendell. Anomie, social isolation, and the class structure. Sociometry, 1957, 20, No. 2 (June), 105-116.

Bell, Wendell; Hill, Richard J.; and Wright, Charles R. Public leadership. San Francisco: Chandler, 1961.

Bendix, Reinhard, and Lipset, Seymour M. (eds.). Class, status and power: Social stratification in comparative perspective. (2nd ed.) New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1966.

Bennett, William S., Jr., and Gist, Noel P. Class and family influences on student aspirations. SF, 1964, 43, No. 2 (December), 167-173.

Berelson, Bernard R., and Janowitz, Morris. (eds.) Reader in public opinion and communication. (2nd ed.) New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1966.

Berelson, Bernard R.; Lazarsfeld, Paul F.; and McPhee, William N. Voting: A study of opinion formation in a presidential campaign. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Berelson, Bernard, and Steiner, Gary A. Human behavior: An inventory of scientific findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964.

Bernard, Sydney E. Fatherless families: Their economic and social adjustment. Waltham, Mass.: The Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, 1964.

Bernstein, Basil. Some sociological determinants of perception. Brit. J. Sociol., 1958, 9, No. 2 (June), 159-174.

____________. Language and social class. Brit. J. Sociol., 1960, 11, No. 3 (September), 271-276.

____________. Social class, linguistic codes, and grammatical elements. Lang. Speech, 1962, 5, 221-240.

____________(a). Social class and linguistic development: A theory of social learning. In A.H. Halsey, *et al.* (eds.), Education, economy and society. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964. Pp. 288-314.

____________(b). Social class, speech systems and psychotherapy. Brit. J. Sociol., 1964,15, No. 1 (March), 54-64.

Blauner, Robert. Work satisfaction and industrial trends in modern society. Reprint No. 151, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Berkeley, 1960. Also in Walter Galenson and Seymour M. Lipset (eds.), Labor and trade unionism. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1960, pp. 339-360.

Blauner, Robert. Alienation and freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Blood, Robert O., Jr., and Wolfe, Donald M. The dynamics of married living. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.

Bloom, Richard; Whiteman, Martin; and Deutsch, Martin. Race and social class as separate factors related to social environment. AJS, 1965, 70, No. 4 (January), 471-476.

Blum, Zahava D., and Rossi, Peter H. Social class and poverty: A selected and annotated bibliography. Boston, Mass.: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1966. (Mimeographed)

Boek, Walter E.; Sussman, Marvin B.; and Yankauer, Alfred. Social class and child care practices. Marr. Fam. Living, 1958, 20, No. 4 (November), 326-333.

Bond, Floyd A.; Barber, Ray E.; Vieg, John A.; Perry, Louis B.; Scaff, Alvin H.; and Lee, Luther J., Jr. Our needy aged: A California study of a national problem. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1954.

Bordua, David J. Juvenile delinquency and 'anomie': An attempt at replication. Soc. Prob., 1958-1959, 6, 230-238.

Bowerman, Charles E., and Elder, Glen H., Jr. Variations in adolescent perception of family power structure. ASR, 1964, 29, No. 4 (August), 551-567.

Bradburn, Norman M. The structure of psychological well-being. Chicago: Aldine, forthcoming.

Bradburn, Norman, and Caplovitz, David. Reports on happiness. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.

Brim, Orville G.; Neulinger, John.; and Glass, David. Experiences and attitudes of American adults concerning standardized I.Q. tests. Technical Report No. 1 on the Social Consequences of Testing. New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. Socialization and social class through time and space. In R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset (eds.), Class, status and power. New York: The Free Press, 1966, pp. 362-377.

Brown, J. Douglas. The American philosophy of social insurance. Social Service Review, 1956, 30, No. 1 (March), 1-8.

Burchinal, Lee; Gardner, Bruce; and Hawkes, Glenn R. Children's personality adjustment and the socio-economic status of their families. J. Genetic Psychol., 1958, 92 (June), 149-159.

Burgess, M. Elaine; and Price, Daniel O. American dependency challenge. Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1963.

Campbell, Angus; Converse, Philip E.; Miller, Warren E.; and Stokes, Donald E. The American voter. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960.

_____________. Elections and the political order. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Caplovitz, David. The poor pay more. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Caplovitz, David, and Bradburn, Norman M. Social class and psychological adjustment: A portrait of the communities in the "happiness" study. A preliminary report. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, January, 1964.

Cazden, Courtney B. Subcultural differences in child language: An interdisciplinary view. Merrill-Palmer Q., 1966, 12, No. 3 (July), 185-219.

Centers, Richard. The psychology of social classes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Chapman, Ames W. Attitudes toward legal authorities by juveniles. Sociology & Social Research, 1956, 40, No. 3 (January-February), 170-175.

Chilman, Catherine S. Child-rearing and family relationship patterns of the very poor. Welfare in Review, 1965, 3, No. 1 (January), 9-19.

_____________. Growing up poor. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration Publication No. 13 (May), 1966.

Chilton, Roland J. Continuity in delinquency area research: A comparison of studies for Baltimore, Detroit, and Indianapolis. ASR, 1964, 29, No. 1 (February), 71-83.

Christie, Richard, and Cook, Peggy. A guide to published literature relating to the authoritarian personality. Journal of Psychology, 1958, 45, (April), 171-199.

Christie, Richard, and Jahoda, Marie. (Eds.) *Studies in the scope and method of the authoritarian personality: Continuities in social research*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.

Clark, John P., and Wenninger, Eugene P. Social-economic class and area as correlates of illegal behavior among juveniles. *ASR*, 1962, *27*, No. 6 (December), 826-834.

Clark, Robert E. Psychoses, income and occupational prestige. *AJS*, 1949, *54*, No. 5 (March), 433-440.

Clarke, Alfred C. The use of leisure and its relation to levels of occupational prestige. *ASR*, 1956, *21*, No. 3 (June), 301-307.

Clausen, John A., and Kohn, Melvin L. Relations of schizophrenia to the social structure of a small city. In Pasamanick, B. (ed.), *Epidemiology of mental disorder*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1959.

Cloward, Richard A., and Ohlin, Lloyd E. *Delinquency and opportunity*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.

Cohen, Albert K. *Delinquent boys*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1955.

Cohen, Albert N., and Hodges, Harold M., Jr. Characteristics of the lower-blue-collar class. *Soc. Prob.*, 1963, *10*, No. 4 (Spring), 303-333.

Cohen, Jerome. Social work and the culture of poverty. *Soc. Wk.*, 1964, *9*, No. 1 (January), 3-11.

Coleman, James S. *The adolescent society*. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Coleman, James, *et al*. *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education (OE-380001), 1966.

______________. *Equality of educational opportunity: Supplemental appendix*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education (OE-380001 -- Supplement), 1966.

Cooper, Homer Chassell. Social class identification and political party affiliation. *Psychol. Rept.*, 1959, *5*, 337-340.

Coser, Lewis A. Sociology of poverty. *Soc. Prob.*, 1965, *13*, No. 2 (Fall), 140-148.

Curtis, Richard F. Differential association and the stratification of the urban community. *SF*, 1963, *42*, No. 1 (October), 68-76.

Davis, Allison, and Dollard, Jr. *Children of bondage: The personality development of Negro children in the urban south*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940.

Davis, Allison, and Havighurst, Robert J. Social class and color differences in child rearing. *ASR*, 1946, *11*, 698-710.

Davis, Kingsley. Some demographic aspects of poverty in the United States. In Margaret S. Gordon (ed.), Poverty in America. San Francisco: Chandler, 1965, 299-319.

Deasy, Leila Calhoun. Socio-economic status and participation in the poliomyelitis vaccine trial. ASR, 1956, 21, No. 2 (April), 185-191.

DeGrazia, Sebastian. Of time, work and leisure. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1962.

Demerath, Nicholas J., III. Social class, religious affiliation, and styles of religious involvement. In R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset (eds.), Class, status and power. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1966, 388-394.

Dentler, Robert A., and Monroe, Lawrence J. Social correlates of early adolescent theft. ASR, 1961, 26, No. 5 (October), 733-743.

Deutsch, Martin. The role of social class in language development and cognition. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1965, 35, No. 1 (January), 78-88.

Deutsch, Martin, and Brown, Bert. Social influences in Negro-white intelligence differences. J. Soc. Issues, 1964, 20, No. 2 (April), 24-35.

Dohrenwend, Bruce P., and Chin-Shong, Edwin. Social status and attitudes toward psychological disorder: The problem of tolerance of deviance. ASR, 1967, 32, No. 3 (June), 417-433.

Dollard, John. Caste and class in a southern town. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.

Dotson, Floyd. Patterns of voluntary association among urban working class families. ASR, 1951, 16, No. 5 (October), 687-693.

Douvan, Elizabeth. Social success and success striving. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 52, 219-233.

Dreger, Ralph Mason, and Miller, Kent S. Comparative psychological studies of Negroes and whites in the United States. Psychological Bulletin, 1960, 57, No. 5 (September), 361-402.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Hodge, Robert W. Education and occupational mobility: A regression analysis. AJS, 1963, 68, No. 6 (May), 629-644.

Eckland, Bruce K. Genetics and sociology: A reconsideration. ASR, 1967, 32, No. 3 (April), 173-194.

Elder, Glen H., Jr. Structural variations in the child rearing relationship. Sociometry, 1962, 25, No. 4, 241-262.

Ellis, Dean S. Speech and social status in America. SF, 1967, 45, No. 3 (March), 431-437.

Ellis, Dean S. The identification of social status from limited vocal cues. Unpublished paper, Purdue University, Communications Research Center, 1963.

Ellis, John M. Socio-economic differentials in mortality from chronic diseases. In E. Gartly Jaco (ed.), Patients, physicians and illness. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958, 30-37.

Empey, LaMar T. Social class and occupational aspiration: A comparison of absolute and relative measurement. ASR, 1956, 21, No. 6 (December), 703-709.

Engel, Madaline H. A reconsideration of the concept of "American lower class": A study of urban subculture. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1966.

Ennis, Philip H. Adult book reading in the United States: A preliminary report. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, September, 1965.

Ennis, Philip H. Criminal victimization in the United States: A report of a national survey. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967. Field Studies II, U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.

Epstein, Lenore A. Some effects of low income on children and their families. Soc. sec. Bull., 1961, 24, No. 2 (February), 12-17.

Erickson, Maynard L., and Empey, LaMar T. Class, position, peers and delinquency. Sociol. soc. Res., 1965, 49, No. 3 (April), 268-282.

Eron, Leonard D.; Walder, Leonard O.; Toigo, Romolo; and Lefkowitz, Monroe M. Social class, parental punishment for aggression, and child aggression. Child dev., 1963, 34 (December), 849-867.

Faris, Robert, and Dunham, Warren. Mental disorders in urban areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Ferman, Louis A.; Kornbluh, Joyce L.; and Haber, Alan (eds.). Poverty in America. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Findlay, Donald C., and McGuire, Carson. Social status and abstract behavior. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 54 (January), 135-137.

Foskett, John M. Social structure and social participation. ASR, 1955, 20, No. 4 (August), 431-438.

Frazier, E. Franklin. The Negro family in America. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Freeman, Howard E., and Kassebaum, Gene G. Relationship of education and knowledge to opinions about mental illness. Ment. Hyg., 1960, 44 (January), 43-47.

Freeman, Howard E., and Simmons, Ozzie G. Social class and posthospital performance. ASR, 1959, 24, No. 3 (June), 345-351.

Freedman, Ronald; Whelpton, Pascal K.; and Campbell, Arthur A. Family planning, sterility, and population growth. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Freedman, Ronald; Whelpton, Pascal K.; and Smit, John W. Socio-economic factors in religious differentials in fertility. ASR, 1961, 26, No. 4 (August), 608-614.

Friedhoff, W.H. Relationship among various measures of socio-economic status, social class identification, intelligence, and school achievement. Dissertation Abstracts, 1955, Vol. 15.

Frumkin, Robert M. Social factors in schizophrenia. Sociol. soc. Res., 1954, 38, No. 6 (July-August), 383-386.

Gans, Herbert J. The urban villagers. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1962.

Gist, Noel P., and Bennett, William S., Jr. Aspirations of Negro and white students. SF, 1963, 42, No. 1 (October), 40-48.

Glazer, Nathan, and Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. Beyond the melting pot. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. and Harvard University Presses, 1963.

Glick, Ira O., and Levy, Sidney J. Living with television. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1962.

Glick, Paul C., and Carter, Hugh. Marriage patterns and educational level. ASR, 1958, 23, No. 3 (June), 294-300.

Gold, Martin. Undetected delinquent behavior. J. res. Crime and Delinquency, 1966, 3, No. 1 (January), 27-46.

Goodchilds, Jacqueline D., and Smith, Ewart E. The effects of unemployment as mediated by social status. Sociometry, 1963, 26, No. 3 (September), 287-293.

Goode, Erich. Social class and church participation. AJS, 1966, 72, No. 1 (July), 102-111.

Goode, William J. Economic factors and marital stability. ASR, 1951, 16, No. 6 (December), 802-812.

____________. Marital satisfaction and instability: A cross-cultural analysis of divorce rates. In R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset (eds.), Class, status, and power. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1966, 377-387.

Gordon, Margaret S. (ed.). Poverty in America. San Francisco: Chandler, 1965.

Gosnell, Harold F. Machine politics: Chicago style. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

Graham, Saxon. Socio-economic status, illness, and the use of medical services. In E. Gartly Jaco (ed.), Patients, physicians and illness. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958, 129-134.

____________. Social factors in relation to chronic illnesses. In Howard E. Freeman, et al., (eds.), Handbook of medical sociology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, 65-98.

Graham, Saxon; Levin, Morton; and Lilienfeld, Abraham M. The socio-economic distribution of cancer of various sites in Buffalo, N.Y. *Cancer*, 1960, *13*, No. 1 (January-February), 180-191.

Gray, Susan W., and Klaus, Rupert A. An experimental preschool program for culturally deprived children. *Child Dev.*, 1965, *36*, No. 4 (December), 887-898.

Greeley, Andrew M. *Religion and career*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.

Greeley, Andrew M., and Rossi, Peter H. *The education of Catholic Americans*. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.

Gurin, Gerald; Veroff, Joseph; and Feld, Shiela. *Americans view their mental health: A nation-wide interview survey*. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Haase, William. The role of socioeconomic class in examiner bias. In Frank Riessman, *et al*. (eds.), *Mental health in the poor*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, 241-247.

Haggstrom, Warren C. The power of the poor. In Louis Ferman, *et al*. (eds.), *Poverty in America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965, 315-335.

Haller, Archibald O., and Shailer, Thomas. Personality correlates of the socio-economic status of adolescent males. *Sociometry*, 1962, *25*, No. 4 (December), 398-404.

Halpert, Harold P. Surveys of public opinions and attitudes about mental illness: Implications for communications activities. *Public Health Rep.*, 1965, *80*, No. 7 (July), 589-597.

Handel, Gerald, and Rainwater, Lee. Persistence and change in working-class life style. *Sociol. soc. Res.*, 1964, *48*, No. 3 (April), 281-288.

Harms, L.S. Listener judgments of status cues in speech. *Quart. J. Speech*, 1961, *47*, No. 2 (April), 164-188.

Harms, L.S. Speaking ability and social class. Paper presented at the 1963 convention of the National Society for the Study of Communication, Denver, Colorado.

Harrington, Michael. *The other America*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962.

Harrison, Saul I.; McDermott, John F.; Wilson, Paul T.; and Schrager, Jules. Social class and mental illness in children. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 1965, *13*, No. 5 (November), 411-417.

Havighurst, Robert J.; Bowman, Paul H.; Liddle, Gordon P.; Matthews, Charles V.; and Pierce, James V. *Growing up in River City*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

Hausknecht, Murray. *The joiners: A sociological description of voluntary association membership in the United States*. New York: The Bedminster Press, 1962.

Herriott, Robert E., and St. John, Nancy Hoyt. Social class and the urban school. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

____________. Early experiences and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Dev., 1965, 36, No. 4 (December), 869-885.

Hess, Robert D., and Shipman, Virginia C. (a). Cognitive elements in maternal behavior. Unpublished paper, University of Chicago, 1966.

____________ (b). Maternal attitudes toward the school and the role of the pupil: Some social class comparisons. In A. Henry Passow (ed.), Fifth work conference on curriculum and teaching in depressed areas. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.

Hicks, Robert A., and Pellegrini, Robert J. The meaningfulness of Negro-white differences in intelligence test performance. Psychol. Rec., 1966, 16, No. 1 (January), 43-46.

Himeloch, Jerome, and Fava, Sylvia F. (eds.). Sexual behavior in American society: An appraisal of the first two Kinsey reports. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1955.

Hodge, Robert W., and Treiman, Donald J. Occupational mobility and attitudes toward Negroes. ASR, 1966, 31, No. 1 (February), 93-102.

____________. Class identification in the United States. AJS, forthcoming.

Hodge, Robert W.,; Treiman, Donald J.; and Rossi, Peter H. A comparative study of occupational prestige. In R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset (eds), Class, status, and power. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1966, 309-321.

Hodge, Robert W.; Siegel, Paul M.; and Rossi, Peter H. Occupational prestige in the United States: 1925-1963. In R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset (eds.), Class, status, and power. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1966.

Hoffman, Martin L., and Hoffman, Lois W. (eds.). Review of child development research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Hoffman, Martin L.; Mitsos, Spiro B.; and Protz, Roland E. Achievement striving, social class and test anxiety. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol. 1958, 56, No. 3 (May), 401-403.

Hollingshead, August B. Class differences in family stability. Annals, 1950, 272 (November), 39-46.

Hollingshead, August B., and Redlich, Frederick C. Social class and mental illness: A community study. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958.

Hylan, Lewis. Child rearing among low-income families. In Louis Ferman, et al. (eds.), Poverty in America. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965, 342-353.

Hyman, Herbert H. The value systems of different classes: A social psychological contribution to the analysis of stratification. In R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset (eds.), *Class, status, and power*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1966, 488-499.

Inkeles, Alex. Industrial man: The relation of status to experience, perception and value. *AJS*, 1960, *66*, No. 1 (July), 1-31.

Jackson, Luther P. *Poverty's children*. Washington, D.C.: The Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area, March, 1966 (mimeographed).

Jaco, E. Gartley. *The social epidemiology of mental disorders*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1960.

Jaffe, Frederick S. Family planning and poverty. In Louis A. Ferman, *et al.* (eds.), *Poverty in America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965, 335-341.

Jahoda, M. *Current concepts of positive mental health*. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

James, Rita M. Status and competence of jurors. *AJS*, 1964, *59*, No. 6 (May), 563-570.

Janowitz, Morris, and Marvick, Dwaine. Authoritarianism and political behavior. *Pub. Opin. Q.*, 1953, *17*, No. 2 (Summer), 185-202.

Jenkins, C. David. Group differences in perception: A study of community beliefs and feelings about TB. *AJS*, 1966, *71*, No. 4 (January), 417-429.

Johnsen, Kathryn P., and Leslie, Gerald R. Methodological notes on research in child rearing and social class. *Merrill-Palmer Q.*, 1965, *11*, No. 4 (October), 345-358.

Johnson, Cyrus M., and Kerckhoff, Alan C. Family norms, social position, and the value of change. *SF*, 1964, *43*, No. 2 (December), 149-156.

Johnstone, John, W.C., and Rivera, Ramon J. *Volunteers for learning*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.

Kadushin, Charles. Social distance between client and professionals. *AJS*, 1962, *67*, No. 5 (March), 517-531.

____________. Social class and the experience of ill health. *Soc. Inquiry*, 1964, *34*, No. 1 (Winter), 67-80. Also in R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset (eds.), *Class, status, and power*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1966, 406-412.

Kadushin, Charles. Social class and ill health: The need for further research. A reply to Antonovsky. *Sociological Inquiry*, 1967, *37*, No. 2 (Spring), 323-332.

Kahl, Joseph A. Some measurements of achievement orientation. *AJS*, 1965, *70*, No. 6 (May), 669-681.

Kantor, Mildred B.; Glidewell, John C.; Mensh, Ivan H.; Domke, Herbert R.; and Glides, Margaret C.L. Socio-economic level and maternal attitudes toward parent-child relationship. Hum. Org., 1958, 16, No. 4 (Winter), 44-48.

Kaplan, Bert; Reed, Robert; and Richardson, Wyman. A comparison of the incidence of hospitalized and non-hospitalized cases of psychosis in two communities. ASR, 1956, 21, No. 4, 474-479.

Keller, Suzanne. The social world of the urban slum child: Some early findings. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1963, 33, No. 5, 823-831.

Keller, Suzanne. The American lower class family. Albany: New York State Division for Youth. Research Document, 1966.

Keller, Suzanne, and Zavalloni, Marisa. Ambition and social class: A respecification. SF, 1964, 43, No. 1 (October), 58-70.

King, Morton B., Jr. Socioeconomic status and sociometric choice. SF, 1961, 39, 199-206.

Kinsey, Alfred, et al. Sexual behavior in the human female. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1953.

____________. Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia: Saunders. 1948.

Kiser, Clyde V. (ed.). Research in family planning. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Klatskin, Ethelyn H. Shifts in child care practices in three social classes under an infant care program of flexible methodology. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1952, 22, 52-61.

Kleiner, Robert J., and Parker, Seymour. Goal-striving, social status, and mental disorder: A research review. ASR, 1963, 28, No. 2 (April), 189-203.

Kleiner, Robert J.; Tuckman, Jacob; and Lavell, Martha. Mental disorder and status based on race. Psychiatry, 1960, 23, No. 3 (August), 271-274.

Kluckhohn, Florence R. Dominant and substitute profiles of cultural orientations: Their significance for the analysis of social structure. SF, 1950, 28, No. 4 (May), 376-393.

____________. Dominant and variant cultural value orientations. Social Welfare Forum, 1951, 97-113.

Kluckhohn, Florence R., and Strodtbeck, Fred L. Variations in value orientation. New York: Row, Peterson, and Co., 1961.

Knief, Lotus M., and Stroud, James B. Intercorrelations among various intelligence, achievement, and social class scores. J. of Educational Psychology, 1959, 50, No. 3 (June), 117-120.

Knupfer, Genevieve. Portrait of the underdog. *Pub. Opin. Q.*, 1947, *11*, No. 1 (Spring), 103-114.

Kohn, Melvin L. (a). Social class and parental values. *AJS*, 1959, *64*, No. 4 (January), 337-351.

__________ (b). Social class and the exercise of parental authority. *ASR*, 1959, *24*, No. 3 (June), 352-366.

Kohn, Melvin L. Social class and parent-child relationships: An interpretation. *AJS*, 1963, *68*, (January), 471-480.

Kohn, Melvin L., and Carroll, Eleanor E. Social class and the allocation of parental responsibilities. *Sociometry*, 1960, *23*, No. 4 (December), 372-392.

Komarovsky, Mira. *Blue-collar marriage*. New York: Random House, 1964.

Krause, Elliott A. *Factors related to length of mental hospital stay: A review of the literature*. Boston: Massachusetts Department of Mental Health, 1967, publication No. 3M-6-66-943307.

Krauss, Irving. Sources of educational aspirations among working-class youth. *ASR*, 1964, *29*, No. 6 (December), 867-879.

Kriesberg, Louis. Socioeconomic rank and behavior. *Soc. Prob.*, 1963, *10*, No. 4 (Spring), 334-352.

Kriesberg, Louis, and Treiman, Beatrice R. Socioeconomic status and the utilization of dentists' services. *J. Amer. Coll. Dentists*, 1960, *27*, No. 3 (September), 145-167.

Labov, William. Phonological correlates of social stratification. *Amer. Anthro.*, 1964, *66*, No. 6, Part 2 (December), 164-176.

Lambert, Wallace E., and Klineberg, Otto. Cultural comparisons of boys' occupational aspirations. *Brit. J. soc. clin. Psychol.*, 1963, *3*, No. 1 (February), 56-65.

Lander, Bernard. *Towards an understanding of juvenile delinquency: A study of 8,464 cases of juvenile delinquency in Baltimore*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.

Landis, Judson. Values and limitations of family research using student subjects. *Marriage and Family Living*, 1957, 19, No. 1 (February).

Lane, Robert E. *Political ideology: Why the common man believes what he does*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Langner, Thomas S., and Michael, Stanley T. *Life stress and mental illness*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Larrabee, Eric, and Meyersohn, Rolf (eds.). *Mass leisure*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Laughton, Katherine B.; Buck, Carol W.; and Hobbs, G.E. Socio-economic status and illness. Mil. Mem. Fund Q., 1958, 36, No. 1 (January), 46-57.

Lawrence, P.S. Chronic illness and socio-economic status. In E. Gartly Jaco (ed.), Patients, physicians, and illness. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958, 37-49.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F.; Berelson, Bernard R.; and Gaudet, Hazel. The people's choice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948.

Lefton, Mark; Angrist, Shirley; Dinitz, Simon; and Pasamanick, Benjamin. Social class, expectations, and performance of mental patients. AJS, 1962, 68, No. 1 (July), 79-88.

Lemkau, Paul V., and Crocetti, Guido M. An urban population's opinion and knowledge about mental illness. Amer J. Psychiat., 1962, 118, No. 8 (February), 692-700.

Leslie, Gerald R., and Johnsen, Kathryn P. Changed perceptions of the maternal role. ASR, 1963, 28 (December), 919-928.

Levine, G.N. Anxiety about illness: Psychological and social bases. J. Health Human Behavior, 1962, 3, No. 2 (Spring), 30-34.

Lewis, Hylan. Child rearing among low-income families. Address to the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, Washington, D.C., June 8, 1961. (mimeographed).

Lewis, Oscar. Five families. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

__________. The children of Sánchez. New York: Basic Books, 1961.

__________. La vida: A Puerto Rican family in the culture of poverty -- San Juan and New York. New York: Random House, 1965.

Linn, Erwin L. Patients' socioeconomic characteristics and release from a mental hospital. AJS, 1959, 65, No. 3 (November), 280-286.

Lipset, Seymour M. Democracy and working class authoritarianism. ASR, 1959, 24, No. 4 (August), 482-501.

__________. The value patterns of democracy: A case study in comparative analysis. ASR, 1963, 28 (August), 515-531.

Lipset, Seymour M.; Lazarsfeld, Paul F.; Barton, Allen H.; and Linz, Juan. The psychology of voting: An analysis of political behavior. In Gardner Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954, 1124-1175.

Lipsitz, Lewis. Working class authoritarianism -- A re-evaluation. ASR, 1965, 30, No. 1 (February), 103-110.

Little, J. Kenneth. A statewide inquiry into decisions of youth about education beyond high school. Madison: School of Education, University of Wisconsin, 1958.

Littman, Richard A.; Moore, Robert C.A.; and Pierce-Jones, John. Social class differences in child rearing: A third community for comparison with Chicago and Newton. *ASR*, 1957, *22*, No. 6 (December), 694-704.

Lockwood, David. The "new working class." *Eur. J. Sociol*., 1960, *1*, No. 2, 248-259.

Lyman, Elizabeth L. Occupational differences in the value attached to work. *AJS*, 1955, *61*, No. 2 (September), 138-145.

Marris, Peter, and Rein, Martin. *Dilemmas of social reform: Poverty and community action in the United States*. New York: Atherton Press, 1967.

Marx, Karl. *The eighteenth brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. Translated by Daniel De Leon. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Co., 1914.

Matthews, Donald R. *Social background of political decision makers*. New York: Random House, 1954.

Matza, David. The disreputable poor. In R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset (eds.), *Class, status, and power*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1966, 289-302.

Mayer, Albert J., and Hauser, Philip M. Class differentials in expectations of life at birth. *Rev. inst. intern. statistique* (Review of the International Statistical Institute), 1950, *18*, 197-200.

McClelland, D.C.; Atkinson, J.W.; Clark, R.A.; and Lowell, E.L. *The achievement motive*. New York: Appleton-Enturty-Crofts, 1953.

McDermott, John F.; Harrison, Saul I.; Schrager, Jules; and Wilson, Paul. Social class and mental illness in children: Observations of blue-collar families. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat*., 1965, *35*, No. 3 (April), 500-508.

Meier, Dorothy L., and Bell, Wendell. Anomia and differential access to the achievement of life goals. *ASR*, 1959, *24*, 189-202.

Mensh, Ivan N.; Kantor, Mildred B.; Domke, Herbert R.; Gildea, Margaret C.L.; and Glidewell, John C. Children's behavior symptoms and their relationship to social adjustment, sex, and social class. *J. soc*. Issues, 1959, *15*, No. 1, 8-15.

Merton, Robert K. Continuities in the theory of social structure and anomie. *Social theory and social structure*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957, 161-194.

Meyer, J.K. Attitudes toward mental illness in a Maryland community. *Public Health Rep*., 1964, *79*, No. 9 (September), 769-772.

Michael, John A. High school climates and plans for entering college. *Pub. Opin. Q*., 1961, *25*, No. 4 (Winter), 585-595.

Miller, Daniel R., and Swanson, Guy E. The changing American parent. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958.

Miller, Henry. Characteristics of AFDC families. Soc. serv. Rev., 1965, 39, No. 4 (December), 349-409.

Miller, S.M. The American lower classes: A typological approach. Soc. Res., 1964, 31, No. 1 (Spring), 1-22.

__________. The "new" working class. In Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg (eds.), Blue-collar world: Studies of the American worker. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964, pp. 2-9.

Miller, S.M., and Riessman, Frank (a). Working class authoritarianism: A critique of Lipset. Brit. J. Soc., 1961, 12, 263-273.

_____________(b). The working class sub-culture: A new view. Soc. Prob., 1961, 9, No. 1 (Summer), 86-97.

Miller, S.M.; Riessman, Frank; and Seagull, Arthur A. Poverty and self-indulgence: A critique of the non-deferred gratification pattern. In Louis Ferman, et al. (eds.), Poverty in America. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Miller, Walter B. Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. J. soc. Issues, 1958, 14, No. 3, 5-19.

_______________. Implications of urban lower-class culture for social work. Soc. serv. Rev., 1959, 33, No. 3 (September), 219-236.

_______________. City gangs. New York: John Wiley & Sons, forthcoming.

Miner, John B. Intelligence in the United States. New York: Springer, 1957.

Mischel, Walter. Preference for delayed reinforcement: An experimental study of cultural observation. J. abnorm. Psychol., 1958, 56, 57-61.

Moles, Oliver C., Jr. Training children in low-income families for school. Welfare in Review, 1965, 3, No. 6 (June), 1-11.

Moles, Oliver C., Jr. Child training practices among low-income families. Welfare in Review, 1965, 3, No. 12 (December), 1-19.

Morgan, James N. The achievement motive and economic behavior. In John W. Atkinson and Norman T. Feather (eds.), A theory of achievement motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966, pp. 205-230.

Morgan, James N.; David, Martin H.; Cohen, Wilbur J.; and Brazer, Harvey E. Income and welfare in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Morse, Nancy C., and Weiss, Robert S. The function and meaning of work and the job. ASR, 1955, 20, No. 2 (April), 191-198.

Moynihan, Daniel P. The Negro family: The case for national action. In Lee Rainwater and William L. Yancey (eds.), The Moynihan report and the politics of controversy. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Muir, Donald E., and Weinstein, Eugene A. The social debt: An investigation of lower class and middle class norms of social obligation. ASR, 1962, 27, No. 4 (August), 532-539.

Mulligan, Raymond A. Socioeconomic background and minority attitudes. Sociol. soc. Res., 1961, 45, No. 3 (April), 289-294.

Nichols, Robert C. Nature and nurture in adolescence. In J.S. Adama (ed.), Contributions to the understanding of adolescence. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

Nye, F. Ivan. Adolescent-parent adjustment -- Socio-economic level as a variable. ASR, 1951, 16, No. 3 (June), 341-349.

Nye, F. Ivan, and Hoffman, Lois W. The employed mother in America. Chicago: Rand McNally, & Company, 1963.

Nye, F. Ivan; Short, James F.; and Olson, Virgil J. Socio-economic status and delinquent behavior. AJS, 1958, 63, No. 4 (January), 381-389.

Ohlendorf, George; Wages, Sherry; and Kuvlesky, William P. A bibliography of literature on status projections of youth. College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, 1967.

Olim, Ellis G.; Hess, Robert D.; and Shipman, Virginia C. Role of mothers' language styles in mediating their pre-school children's cognitive development. School Review, 1967, 75, No. 4 (Winter), 414-424.

Olsen, Marvin E. Distribution of family responsibilities and social stratification. Marr. Fam. Living, 1960, 22, No. 1 (February), 60-65.

Orden, Susan R., and Bradburn, Norman M. Dimensions of marriage happiness. AJS, 1968, forthcoming.

Orshansky, Mollie. Counting the poor: Another look at the poverty profile. Social sec. Bull., 1965, 28, (January), 3-29.

Ossenberg, Richard J. The experience of deviance in the patient-role: A study of class differences. J. Hlth. Hum. Behav., 1962, 3, No. 4 (Winter), 277-282.

Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Participation in outdoor recreation: Factors affecting demand among American adults. Report No. 20. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962. (Report by Eva Mueller and Gerald Gurin)

Palmore, Erdman. Factors associated with school dropouts and juvenile delinquency among lower-class children. Soc. sec. Bull., 1963, 26, No. 10 (October), 4-9.

Palmore, Erdman, and Hammond, Phillip E. Interacting factors in juvenile delinquency. *ASR*, 1964, *29*, No. 6 (December), 848-854.

Parsons, Talcott. A revised analytical approach to the theory of social stratification. *Essays in sociological theory* (rev. ed.). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954, pp. 386-439.

Pasamanick, Benjamin; Dinitz, Simon; and Lefton, Mark. Psychiatric orientation and its relation to diagnosis and treatment in a mental hospital. *Amer. J. Psychiatry*, 1959, *116*, No. 1 (July), 127-132.

Pavenstedt, Eleanor. A comparison of the child-rearing environment of upper-lower and very low-lower class families. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.*, 1965, *35*, No. 1 (January), 89-98.

Pearl, Arthur, and Riessman, Frank. *New careers for the poor*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1965.

Pearlin, Leonard I., and Kohn, Melvin L. Social class, occupation and parental values: A cross-national study. *ASR*, 1966, *31*, No. 4 (August), 466-479.

Piliavin, Irving, and Briar, Scott. Police encounters with juveniles. *AJS*, 1964, *70*, No. 2 (September), 206-214.

Pinner, Frank A.; Jacobs, Paul; and Selznick, Philip. *Old age and political behavior*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959.

Powdermaker, Hortense. *After freedom: A cultural study in the deep south*. New York: Viking Press, 1939.

Putnam, G.N., and O'Hern, E.M. The status significance of an isolated urban dialect. *Language*, 1955, *31*, No. 4, *Part 2* (October-December), 1-32.

Rainwater, Lee. *The problem of lower class culture*. Pruitt-Igoe Occasional Paper 8, September 23, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

Rainwater, Lee; Coleman, Richard P.; and Handel, Gerald. *Workingman's wife*. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1959.

Rainwater, Lee, and Weinstein, Karol Kane. *And the poor get children*. Chicago: Quadrangle Bools, 1960.

Reiss, Albert J., Jr., and Rhodes, Albert Lewis. The distribution of juvenile delinquency in the social class structure. *ASR*, 1961, *26*, No. 5 (October), 720-732.

__________. Status deprivation and delinquent behavior. *Soc. Quart.*, 1963, *4*, No. 2 (Spring), 135-149.

Reiss, Ira L. Social class and premarital sexual permissiveness: A re-examination. *ASR*, 1965, *30*, No. 5 (October), 747-756.

Reissman, Leonard. Levels of aspirations and social class. *ASR* , 1953, *18*, No. 3 (June), 233-242.

__________. Class, leisure and social participation. ASR, 1953, 19, No. 1 (February), 76-84.

Riesman, David. Individualism reconsidered. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.

Riessman, Frank. The culturally deprived child. New York: Harper Row, 1962.

__________. Lower income culture: The strengths of the poor. J. Marr. Fam., 1964, 26, No. 4 (November), 417-421.

Riessman, Frank; Cohen, Jerome; and Pearl, Arthur (eds.). Mental health of the poor. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Riessman, Frank, and Miller, S.M. Social class and projective tests. J. prof. Techn., 1958, 22, No. 4 (November), 432-439. Also in Frank Riessman, et al. (eds.), Mental health of the poor. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Riessman, Frank, and Scribner, Sylvia. The under-utilization of mental health services by workers and low-income groups: Causes and cures. Amer.J. Psychiatry, 1965, 121, No. 8 (February), 798-801.

Rivera, Ramon J., and Short, James F., Jr. Occupational goals: A comparative analysis. In Malcolm W. Klein (ed.), Juvenile gangs in context. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Robins, Lee N.; Gymon, Harry; and O'Neal, Patricia. Interaction of social class and deviant behavior. ASR, 1962, 27, No. 4 (August), 480-492.

Robinson, H. Alan; Connors, Ralph P.; and Whitacre, G. Holly. Job satisfaction researches of 1964-65. Personnel and guidance J., 1966, 45, No. 4 (December), 371-379.

Rodman, Hyman. On understanding lower class behavior. Soc. econ. Stud., 1959, 8 (December), 441-450.

__________. The lower class value stretch. SF, 1963, 42, No. 2 (December), 205-215.

Rodman, Hyman, and Grams, Paul. Juvenile delinquency and the family: A review and discussion. In the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task force report: Juvenile delinquency and youth crime. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967, pp. 188-221.

Rosen, Bernard C. The achievement syndrome: A psycholcultural dimension of social stratification. ASR, 1956, 21, No. 2 (April), 203-211.

__________. Race, ethnicity, and the achievement syndrome. ASR, 1959, 24, No. 1 (February), 47-60.

Rosen, Bernard C., and D'Andrade, Roy. The psychosocial origins of achievement motivation. Sociometry, 1959, 22, 185-218.

Rosenberg, Morris. Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Rosengren, William R. Social status, attitudes toward pregnancy childrearing attitudes. SF, 1962, 41, No. 2 (December), 127-134.

__________. The hospital careers of lower and middle-class child psychiatric patients. Psychiatry, 1962, 25, No. 1 (February), 16-22.

Ross, John A. Social class and medical care. J Hlth. hum. Behav., 1962, 3, No. 1 (Spring), 35-40.

Rossi, Peter H. Why families move. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.

Rossi, Peter H.; Raphael, Edna; and Davis, James A. Social factors in academic achievement. National Opinion Research Center, July, 1959 (multilithed).

Roth, J., and Peck, R.F. Social class and social mobility factors related to marital adjustment. ASR, 1951, 16, No. 4 (August), 478-487.

Scanzoni, John. Socialization, n Achievement, and achievement values. ASR, 1967, 32, No. 3 (June), 449-456.

Schatzman, Leonard, and Strauss, Anselm. Social class and modes of communication. AJS, 1955, 60, No. 4 (January), 329-339.

Schlitz, Michael E. Public attitudes toward social security, 1935-1965. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1968.

Schneider, Louis, and Lysgaard, Sverre. The deferred gratification pattern: A preliminary study. ASR, 1953, 18, No. 2 (April), 142-149.

Schneiderman, Leonard. Value orientation preferences of chronic relief recipients. Soc. Wk., 1964, 9 No. 3, (July), 13-18.

__________. Social class, diagnosis and treatment. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1965, 35, No. 1 (January), 99-105.

Sears, R.R.; Maccoby, E.E.; and Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Sewell, William H. Social class and childhood personality. Sociometry, 1961, 24, No. 4 (December), 340-356.

Sewell, William H., and Haller, Archibald O. Social status and personality adjustment of the child. Sociometry, 1956, 19, No. 2 (June), 114-125.

Sewell, William H.; and Haller, Archibald O.; and Strauss, Murray A. Social status and educational and occupational aspiration. ASR, 1957, 22, No. 1 (February), 67-73.

Sewell, William H., and Shah, Vimal P. Socioeconomic status, intelligence and the attainment of higher education. Sociol. Educ., 1967, 40, No. 1 (Winter), 1-23.

Sexton, Patricia C. Education and income: Inequalities of opportunity in our public schools. New York: Viking Press, 1961.

Short, James F., and Strodtbeck, Fred L. Group process and gang delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Short, James F., et al. Perceived opportunities, gang membership and delinquency. ASR, 1965, 60, 56-67.

Shostak, Arthur B., and Gomberg, William. Blue-collar world: Studies of the American worker. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in black and white. New York: Random House, 1964.

Siller, Jerome. Socioeconomic status and conceptual thinking. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 55, No. 3 (January), 365-371.

Simmons, Ozzie G. Social status and public health. Social Science Research Council, Pamphlet No. 13, May, 1958.

Simpson, Richard L. A note on status, mobility and anomie. Brit. J Soc., 1960, 11, No. 4 (December), 370-372.

__________. Parental influence, anticipatory socialization and social mobility. ASR, 1962, 27, No. 4 (August), 517-522.

Simpson, Richard L., and Miller, H. Max. Social status and anomia. Soc. Prob., 1963, 10, No. 3 (Winter), 256-264.

Simpson, Richard L., and Simpson, Ida Harper. Social origins, occupational advice, occupational values, and work careers. SF, 1962, 40, No. 3 (March), 264-271.

Srole, Leo; Langner, Thomas S.; Michael, Stanley T.; Opler, Marvin K.; and Rennie, Thomas A.C. Mental health in the metropolis: The midtown Manhattan study. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Star, Shirley A. The National Opinion Research Center study. In Psychiatry, the press, and the public. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association, 1956, pp. 1-5.

__________. The public's ideas about mental illness. Presented at annual meeting of the National Association for Mental Health, Indianapolis, Indiana, November, 1955 (mimeographed).

Steiner, Gary A. The people look at television. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Stember, Charles H., et al. Jews in the mind of America. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Stephenson, Richard M. Mobility orientations and stratification of 1,000 ninth graders. ASR, 1957, 22, (April), 204-212.

Stockwell, Edward G. Infant mortality and socio-economic status: A changing relationship. Milbank Memor. Fund Q., 1962, 40, No. 1 (January), 101-111.

Stouffer, Samuel A. Communism, conformity and civil liberties. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1955.

Straus, Murray A. Deferred gratification, social class, and the achievement syndrome. ASR, 1962, 27, No. 3 (June), 326-335.

Strodtbeck, Fred L. Family interaction, values, and achievement. In McClelland and Co. (ed.), Talent and society. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1958, pp. 135-194.

Strodtbeck, Fred L.; Simon, Rita James; and Hawkins, Charles. Social status in jury deliberations. In Ivan D. Steiner and Martin Fishbein (eds.), Current studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965, pp. 333-341.

Swinehart, James W. Socioeconomic level, status aspiration and maternal roles. ASR, 1963, 28, No. 3 (June), 391-398.

Szalai, Alexander. The multinational comparative time budget research project. American Behavioral Scientist, 1966, 10, No. 4 (December), 1-13.

Thernstrom, Stephan. Progress and poverty: Social mobility in a nineteenth century city. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Treiman, Donald J. Status discrepancy and prejudice. AJS, 1966, 71, No. 6 (May), 651-664.

Triandis, H.C., and Triandis, L.M. Race, social class, religion and nationality as determinants of social distance. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1960, 61, 110-118.

Turner, Ralph H. Some family determinants of ambition. Soc. soc. Res., 1962, 46, No. 4 (July), 397-411.

Udry, J. Richard. Marital instability by race, sex, education, and occupation using 1960 census data. AJS, 1966, 72, No. 2 (September), 203-209.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current population reports, technical studies, "Lifetime occupational mobility of adult males: March, 1962." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964, Series P-23, No. 11.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Inmates of Institutions. Final Report PC(2)-8A. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Racial isolation in the public schools*. 2 volumes. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Policy Planning and Research. *The Negro family: The case for national action*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965. (Study authored by Daniel Patrick Moynihan.)

U.S. National Center for Health Statistics, *Medical care, health status, and family income*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service, 1964 (Series 10, No. 9).

Vincent, Clark E. The unwed mother and the sampling bias. *ASR*, 1954, *19*, No. 5 (October), 562-567.

Voss, Harwin L. Differential association and reported delinquent behavior: A replication. *Soc. Prob.*, 1964, *12* (Summer), 78-85.

__________. Socio-economic status and reported delinquent behavior. *Soc. Prob.*, 1966, *13*, No. 3 (Winter), 314-324.

Warner, W. Lloyd, *et al*. *Democracy in Jonesville*. New York: Harper and Rose, 1949a.

__________. *Social class in America*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949b.

Westie, Frank R. Negro-white status differentials and social distance. *ASR*, 1952, *17*, No. 5 (October), 550-558.

Westie, Frank R., and Howard, David H. Social status differentials and the race attitudes of Negroes. *ASR*, 1954, *19*, No. 5 (October), 584-591.

Westie, Frank R., and Westie, Margaret. The social distance pyramid: Relationship between caste and class. *AJS*, 1957, *63*, No. 2 (September), 190-196.

Westoff, Charles F. Differential fertility in the United States. *ASR*, 1954, *19*, No. 5 (October), 549-561.

White, Martha Sturm. Social class, child-rearing practices and child behavior. *ASR*, 1957, *22* (December), 704-712.

White, R. Clyde. Social class differences in the uses of leisure. *AJS*, 1955, *61*, No. 2 (September), 145-510.

Whyte, William F. *Street corner society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Wilensky, Harold L. (a). Mass society and mass culture: Interdependence or independence? *ASR*, 1964, *29*, No. 2 (April), 173-197.

Wilensky, Harol L. (b). Varieties of work experience. In Henry Borow (ed.), *Man in a world at work*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964, pp. 125-154.

Wilensky, Harold L., and Ladinsky, Jack. From religious community to occupational group: Structural assimilation among professors, lawyers, and engineers. ASR, 1967, 32, No. 4 (August), 541-561.

Willie, Charles V. A research note on the changing association between infant mortality and socioeconomic status. SF, 1959, 37, No. 3 (March), 221-227.

Wilson, Alan B. Residential segregation of social classes and aspirations of youth. ASR, 1959, 24, No. 6 (December), 836-845.

Wolf, R. The measurement of environments. Proceedings of the 1964 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1965.

Woodward, Julian, and Roper, Elmo. The political activity of American citizens. Amer. Pol. Sci. Rev., 1950, 44, No. 4 (December), 872-885.

Wortis, Helen; Bardach, J.L.; Cutler, R.; Rue, R.; and Freedman, A. Child rearing practices in a low socio-economic group. Pediatrics, 1963, 32, No. 2 (August), 298-307.

Wright, Charles R., and Hyman, Herbert H. Voluntary association memberships of American adults: Evidence from national sample surveys. ASR, 1958, 23 (June), 284-294.

Yinger, J. Milton. Contraculture and subculture. ASR, 1960, 25, No. 5 (October), 625-635.

Zeisel, Joseph S. The workweek in American industry, 1850-1956. U.S. Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review, 1958, 81, No. 1 (January), 23-29.